

**ATTEMPTS AT PRESBYTERIAN - EPISCOPAL ACCOMMODATION IN  
SCOTLAND AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE IN MODERN MOVEMENTS OF**

**UNITY**

**THESIS FOR THE PH. D.**

**REV. MATTHEW JOHN ROBERTS M.A.**

**1949**

---

ProQuest Number: 13870139

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13870139

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## INTRODUCTION

-----

The Attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation in Scotland were initiated within the lifetime of Knox.They have been traced from the Era of Superintendency ,through the Tulchan period , to the 1610 Settlement and to the 1660 Establishment .Even the Presbyterian Establishment of the Revolution may be in some measure regarded as an accommodation for it comprehended not an inconsiderable number of Episcopal incumbents .The pacific activity of the 19 th Century associated with such men as Ewing , Ramsay ,Rorison ,Lee , Tulloch and Wordsworth have been examined .Within the present century the efforts of James Cooper have also been described .With the growing irenaic activity expressed through the Lambeth Conferences and the Oecumenical Movement ,attempts at Presbyterian - Episcopal Accommodation in Scotland have become necessarily integrated with the wider issues of re-union .This is made apparent by the attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation in the United States ,Canada , Australia ,Iran and South India ,in which Church a Presbyterian Minister of the Church of Scotland has been consecrated Bishop of Madura .

In this Thesis a collation has been made, it is believed for the first time , of all serious attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation in Scotland and their influence

on similar modern movements now happily of less provincial concern . To this end documents relating to pacific activity from the Knoxian Period down to the 1948 Lambeth Conference Reports have been examined .

The Thesis , a result of much research , has been a labour of love to one who as an incumbent of the Church of England has found much fellowship with the clergy of the Church of Scotland .It is the motive of the author that any knowledge thus gained may be dedicated to the cause of the reunion of the two great Establishments .



## Table of Contents

---

### Chapter I pages 3- 32 .

#### First Attempts at Government in the Newly Reformed Church of Scotland .

Origin of Polity - Influence of A' Lasco , Calvin ,  
Luther , Melancthon ( pp I-8 ) -First Book of  
Discipline (pp8-10) - Knox and the Superintendents ,  
their function and place in the Church ( 10-16) .  
Ordinal of Superintendency compared with that of  
Edward VI (16-22 ) - Superintendency as basis for  
a constitutional episcopacy 23-32 .

### Chapter 2 pages 33-66.

#### The Tulchan Episcopate

State of discord in the Church (33-47 ) -Convention  
of Leith 1572 ( 47 ) - Tulchan Bishops (56 ) - Definit~~i~~  
ion of the office 56-61 - The Leith Settlement as a  
Presbyterian Accommodation(63 - 66 ) .

### Chapter 3 pages 67-160

#### The Age of Melville

Andrew Melville (68 ff) - Edinburgh Assembly of  
1575 ant-Episcopal (75 ) - Appointment of visitors (78)  
- Edinburgh Assembly 1576 and Devolution of powers  
of the Episcopate ( 78- 86 ) - Flight of Andrew  
Melville (93 )- James I and Church settlements (93-97 )  
-James attempts Holyrood Accommodation (98) -  
Financial enactments affect church polity ( 101 )-  
Dundee Assembly 1597 accepts King's Proposals - (112)  
- Holyrood Accommodation 1602 and office of Visitor  
(115) - James succeeds to English Throne (118)-  
Hampton Court Conference 1604 (118) - James and  
political motive for episcopacy in Scotland ( 125 )-

B.

### Second Hampton Court Conference

I606 attended by Scotch Bishops (I31) -  
Linlithgow Accommodation I606 ( I32-35 ) -Opposition  
of extreme presbyterians (I40) - General Assembly of  
Linlithgow and Episcopacy ,I608 (I41) - James  
presses policy of accommodation (I32 ff) - The  
" New Discipline " suggests further accommodation  
(I47)- Titulars consecrated per saltum I610  
(I53-I56) . Influence of Glasgow Accommodation on Modern  
Movements of Unity (I56-I59) .

### Chapter 4 . pages I60-I88

-----

#### The I610 ACCOMMODATION

New Episcopate confirmed (I60) - Spottiswoode succeeds to  
primacy ( I62 ) - Stewart Absolutism and New Episcopate  
(I62-7) - Standards of New Establishment discussed at  
Aberdeen Assembly I616 ( I68 ff ) - Five Articles (I73) -  
James visits Scotland (I73-8) - Conflicts between  
Presbyterian and Episcopal Parties ( I80-6) -Continued  
opposition to regal, policy (I87-8) .

### Chapter 5 . pages I89 -2I8

-----

#### The Fate of the I610 Episcopate

Charles I(I89) - Tudor and Stewart Despotism compared(I90-  
I) - I620 Ordinal (I94) -Caroline Policy of repression  
(I99) - New Cannons promulgated (201-4) - Spottiswoode 's  
liberal position (204) - The New Liturgy of I637 (205) -  
Opposition mounts (206-7) - The Tables and Covenant (208-  
9) - Accommodating proposals not accepted by Scottish  
Episcopate (209) - Aberdeen Doctors oppose Covenant (209)  
-The King's Covenant (210) - Moderate Episcopacy rejected  
(212) - Reason of failure of I610 accommodation (214-15)-  
Its influence on Modern Movements of Unity ( 216-18) .

### Appendix pages 219- 223

#### Relations with Irish Episcopate

## Chapter 6 . pages 224-237

---

### The Commonwealth ; Its Influence on Attempts at Accommodation .

Westminster Assembly (226 ) - Allegiance of religious factions -(226-30 ) - Accommodation suggested by Charles (230 ) - Rift between Independents and Presbyterians (231 ) - The Engagement 1647 (231 ) - Cromwell's domination of Scotland (233 ) - The Assembly divided (233 ) - James Durham's pacific work (234 ) .

## Chapter 7 . pages 238- 268

---

### The Restoration and the 1661 Consecrations .

Distraction of pre-Restoration Church(238-40 ) - Charles II's policy and Covenanters (240 ) - Synodical activity (245 ) - James Sharp (246 ) - 1661 Consecrations (251 ) - Leighton's pacific activity (255 ) - Diocesan Assemblies and new establishment (258-60 ) - Privy Council enjoins conformity (260 ) - " The Curates " (261 ) - Policy of repression (264 ) - Covenanters in arms (265 ) .

## Chapter 8 . pages 269- 311

---

### The Restoration Episcopate and the Revolution

Tolerant policy of Tweeddale and Kincardine (269 ) - The Indulgence (270 ) - Unpopularity with Episcopalians and Presbyterians (272 ) - Accommodation by mutual concession (273 ) - Assertory Act (273 ) - Leighton as Archbishop of Glasgow ( 275 ) - Holyrood Accommodation of 1670 (276 ) - The Instructions , another scheme for accommodation ( 278 ) - Paisley Conference and further attempt at accommodation (281-4) - Its failure due to repressive methods of government (285 ) - Attempt to explain accommodation to parishes (286) - Second Indulgence (286-7 ) - Sharp and Lauderdale dominate events (288 ) - Murder of Sharp (289) - Accession of James (290 ) - Positive contribution of Episcopal Establishment (290) - William

Garstares assumes role of Knox and Melville as leader of presbyterians (291) - Scottish Episcopate and the Revolution of 1689 (290-3) - The Convention of Edinburgh abolishes prelacy (293) - Episcopal Church disestablished (294) - presbyterian factions united by need of necessity to support new Establishment (295) - Oath of Assurance, 1690, to be taken by clergy (295) - Causes of failure of Restoration Establishment (296) - Tillotson's scheme of accommodation in England (302) - Views of William of Orange on Church government and accommodation (306) - Episcopalians in new Establishment (310-II) .

Chapter 9      pages 312- 357  
-----

Some Individual Attempts at Effecting a  
Pacific Settlement in the Problems of presbyterian-  
Episcopal Accommodation

John Dury, 1596 (312) - an international figure (313) - as pioneer of oecumenical movement (314) - John Davenant (1572-1641) proposes scheme of accommodation on simple basis (315) - John Forbes (318) - The Irenicum and its accommodation proposals (318-322) - James Ussher (323-326) - His scheme of accommodation (326-332) - Robert Leighton (333) - Assumes Episcopate (334) - His policy of Accommodation (335-342) - His liberal outlook (342) - Cause of his failure (343-347) - The English Latitudinarians ; Tennison and Wake (348) - Secker, Warburton and Tomline (349) - William Law and Charles Daubenny (350) - Bramhall and re-ordination of Scotch ministers (351) - Reason for Anglican apologetic activity (351) - "A Draught for a National Church Accommodation", 1705 . (352-353) - Latitudinarian ascendancy and accommodation uniting two national establishments (354) - Reason for not attempting this (355) - English Dissent and the Act of Union, 1707 . (356-7) .

## Chapter 10    pages 358-407

-----  
 Attempts at Accommodation During the 19 th  
 Century and During the Early Years of the  
 20 th Century .

period of liberal reconstruction (358)- Repeal of Clerical Disabilities Act 1864 (358-60 ) -Lee-Rorison Accommodation Proposals (360-68) - Principal Tulloch and Episcopacy; classic Presbyterian views (368-372 ) -Labours of Bishop Charles Wordsworth to effect an accommodation (373-379) - Work of Bishop Alexanderr Ewing in the tradition of Leighton (380-86 ) - The Disruption and " The Larger Hope " (387 ) - Dr Milligan addresses Assembly on re-union with Episcopal Church (389 ) - Church of Scotland pre-occupied with domestic concerns (390 ) - Foundation of Scottish Christian Unity Association (390 ) -Aberdeen Church Congress 1901 (391 ) - Agreed catechism (391 ) - Dr James Cooper appeals for "wider reunion " to include Episcopal Church (392 )- Archbishop of Melbourne visits Scotland to further re-union (392 ) - Dr Theodore Marshall addresses General Assembly on terms of Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation (392- 394 ) - Lambeth Conference of 1908 and problems of Scottish churches (394-5 ) - Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation most hopeful approach to unity (395 ) - work of Dr James Cooper and his suggested accommodation (395-98) - Aberdeen Conference of 1918(398-99)- suggests "period of preparation " as approach to accommodation (400, 404 ) - Effects of Great war (404 ) - Dr Randall Davidson , Archbishop of Canterbury visits General Assembly (404-5 ) - Union of Established and Free Church of Scotland 1929 ( 405 ) - Dr Cosmo Lang , Archbishop of Canterbury visits Assembly (405 ) - Growth of Colonial Churches and problems of Unity (406 ) - Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation now resolved into a question of " Orders " and not organisation (407 ) .

## Chapter II      pages 408-427 .

---

### The Era of the Lambeth Conferences

First Lambeth Conference 1867 (408) - Second Lambeth Conference 1878 (408) - Third Lambeth Conference, 1888 (409) - Influence of Chicago Convention of Protestant Episcopal Church of America, 1886 (409) --- Fourth Lambeth Conference, 1897 (411) - Influence of 1610 Accommodation on Proposals (412) - 1908 Lambeth Conference (413) - The 1920 Conference and "The Appeal to All Christian People" (414) - Implementation of proposals for pulpit inter-change as practised in the Scottish Episcopal Church discussed (416-417) - Orders prove a bergschrund in unity discussions (418) - Presbyterian doctrine of Orders discussed (418-422) - The 1930 Lambeth Conference and the question of the "Historic Episcopate" (423) - Conference initiates Scheme for Re-union (424) - South India Scheme approved (424) - Lambeth Conference of 1948 and resumption of negotiations between Churches of England and Scotland (426) - Anglican definitions of Orders needed for further advance in matter of accommodation: what is meant by the "Historic Episcopate?" (426-27-

### The Oecumenical Movement

#### Chapter 12      pages 428-450

---

Oecumenical Movement "a universal movement" (428) - Dr Mott founds World Student Christian Federation (428) - Sources of Movement (428) - World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910 (429) - Conference on Faith and Order, Lausanne 1927 (430-433) - Presbyterian contribution to discussions (432-3) - General Assembly Committee report on Lausanne (435) - Other Reports (436-8) - Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order 1937 (438) - Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm 1925 and the challenge of new forces of nationalism (438-439) - Such problems viewed in light of the history of the Church in Scotland during the 16th and 17th centuries (440-1) - Oxford Conference on Church,

## G.

Community and State ,1937 (441- 443 ) - Report on problem of " personal compromise " in changed conditions of the modern world (442 ) - " Church " and " sect " types of Christianity ( 442 ) - Faith and Order Movements and Life and Work combine to form World Council of Churches ( 443 ) - Christian Youth Movements and Amsterdam Conference 1939 (443 )- worship and oecumenity ( 444 ) - Influence of Scottish accommodations on matters of a common worship ( 444-5) - Archbishop of Canterbury's 1946 Cambridge Sermon ( 445 )-Oslo World Conference of Christian Youth 1947 (445)- Missionary enterprise and oecumenical movements (446)- Edinburgh Conference 1910 ; Jerusalem Missionary Conference 1928 ; Tambaram Conference 1938 (446)- Knowledge of Church History necessary for solution of reunion difficulties (446) - Lessons of Scotch Church History useful (446)- Tambaram Conference and National Christian Councils (447)- Such need felt in Scottish attempts at accommodation (447)- The Kikuyu Controversy (448-450)- Its lessons for those attempting presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation (450-),

### Attempts at Accommodation in the United States Chapter 13 . pages 451-466.

-----  
Appeal of Bishop Madison for Unity 1792  
(451)-The Muhlenberg Memorial 1853(452-3)- Dr W.R. Huntington formulates idea of the " Quadrilateral" in 1870(453)- Negotiations between Northern Presbyterians and Episcopalians broken off (453)- Effect of " Appeal to all Christian people " (453-4) - May 1938 Proposed Concordat between Protestant Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches (454)- Issue of document entitled " Basic Principals " (454)- Proposals for accommodation (455-464)- Attitude of Liberal Evangelicals in Episcopal Church stated by Dr .Theodore G. Wedel and Dr. Sherman E. Johnson (464-465)-Concurring Minority Report and devolution of Episcopate stated in 1946 (465)- Same arguments used against Leighton's Accommodation (465)- General Convention of Episcopal Church to refer proposals to Lambeth Conference (465-466).

### Attempts at presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation made by the Christian Church in Canada

1886 General Synod of the Church of England in Canada appoints Joint Committee on Unity (467)- United Church of Canada responds to further plea in 1943-Report of Joint Commission of two churches 1946 (467)-The Report (468ff)- Mutual Ordination suggested as means of accommodation (47)-75)- Intercommunion not suggested for the present (475) - Conclusions of the Report (475-479) - Canadian Proposals and influence on reunion movements in Great Britain (479) .

### The South India Scheme

Formation of South India United Church (492) -The wider vision of unity (493 ) - Tranquebar Conference (493-4)- Factors making for necessity of the Union (494-5)- Same factors observed in attempts at accommodation in Scotland ( 497)- South India Church - a Reality ,Madras 1947 (498)- Bishop Palmer's summary of basis of the union (497-99)- Doctrinal difficulties overshadowed by difficulties over Orders (499-501)- Ministerial integration ( 501-2)- Madras Conference of 1929 and conscience clauses ( 502)- The Pledge (503)- The 1934 Interpretation (505-8) - Organisation and Membership of United Church ( 508-)-The Basis of Union (509- 10) -Church of South India and Episcopacy (511-514)- Organisation summarised (515-529) -Worship in the South India Church (527-529) -Lay Celebration (529) - Doctrinal Standards (529- 32)- Church not in full communion with Church of England (532-3)- Anglican criticism (533-35)- Influence of events in Scotland ( 536) -Lambeth Conference of 1948 and the Scheme (536 -8) , Reunion Scheme for Church in Ceylon (539), Baptists included (539)- most representative scheme yet attempted (539)- Ordination Proposals (539-41)- Supplemental Ordination rejected ( 541--)- Negotiations



## I.

between presbyterians and Anglicans in Iran dissolved (541- 2)- American proposals at stand-still ( 542)- South India Church to be strengthened by Lutheran Federation (542)- Influence of the Union in South India (542) .

### CHAPTER 16 pages 544-550

-----

#### Some Modern Developments

Amsterdam Conference 1948(544)-dollarbeg Conference 1948 and Churches of Scotland (545) -Dr John White on Church of Scotland and Reunion ; the present position (546-7)-High Leigh Conference 1948 (547-9)- The British Council of Churches (550-. ).

### GENERAL INDEX .

-----

Pages 578-603 .

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

-----

Pages 551-577 .

-----

## CHAPTER I

---

### First Attempts at Government in the Church of Scotland as newly Reformed .

It is essential for the purpose of this inquiry that a close examination be made of the actual settlement of ecclesiastical government as stated in the First Book of Discipline of 1560 .The chief ministers , as far as organisation is concerned , were the Superintendents .The word itself is suggestive , as its derivation seems , as in the case of another office , that of elder , to have a French equivalent , that of " superintendant " . In this connection it is interesting to observe the judgement of Dr Janet Macgregor " In contrast with the simple Scriptural origin claimed for the Scottish reformed polity , stands the highly composite origin of which internal evidence has been found in the forms of the constitution itself .There is evidence of the formative influences of Lambert's Hessian constitution , of the Swiss , and especially of the Genevan reformation , of the foreign churches of A'Lasco and of Pullain in England , with some slight influence of the Edwardian Church of England itself , and of close study of the new French ecclesiastical polity .

The most obvious and striking influence was found to be that of France .From France , and from A'Lasco's London polity , came the distinctive principle , that the three kinds of office -bearers common to all Presbyterian Churches , as representing the general body of congregational members , were to exercise , in and through the ecclesiastical courts , the legislative , administrative , and judicial

functions of the Church as a corporate body " ( Janet G. Macgregor The Scottish Presbyterian Polity Edinburgh 1926 p 132 ff ) . We must beware , however , of the tendency to ~~underrate~~ the indigenous forces which moulded the early settlement of the Scottish Church ( Maitland Cambridge Modern History vol. II p. 593 ; H.A. Wilson Episcopacy and Unity Lond. 1912 pp 166-7 ; John of Fordoun Chronica Gentis Scotorum III p. 8 , Church Unity Papers p. 37 ) .

Prof. Charles Seignobos characterises Calvinism as being " neither schismatic , liberal , nor democratic . Calvin intended it to be catholic , authoritative , and oligarchical " ( Charles Seignobos : A History of the French People . Bedford Hist. Series 1938 p. 20 ) . In view of such an opinion it is perhaps relevant that we should seek to find the attitude of the Reformers to Episcopacy .

Luther explains : " Our meaning is not to have rule taken away from the bishops : but this one thing only is requested at their hands , that they would suffer the Gospel to be purely taught , and that they will give account to God for this , that by obstancy they afford cause of schism " ( Augsburg Confession Part II art VII ) . Thus Bishop Hall argues " ..... yea , if the last Bishop of Geneva had become a Protestant and consented in matter of doctrine to Calvin , Farel , Viret , have you or any man living just cause to think that the city would not gladly have retained his government still , and thought

themselves happy under his protection ? " ( J. Hall -Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted Intro.para. 2 nd Vol. II and Vol. III p. 126 folio edit . ; H. A. Wilson op. cit . p. 56 ; J.H.Spry Bampton Lectures 1816 Oxon . 1917 p. 327 ) .

The views of Calvin are expressed in the Confession of Faith drawn up in the name of the Gallican Churches where there is a distinct admission : that reverent attention is to be paid to bishops rightly discharging their duties " We confess therefore that Bishops and pastors should be reverently heard in so far as they teach the word of God in accordance with the the nature of their office " ... " If they show us a hierarchy in which the Bishops declare that they do not refuse to be subject to Christ , that they depend on Him as their only head and they derive their significance from him .... then I confess that those who obey them are deserving of no censure " ( text vide J.H. Spry op. cit . p. 397 ) .

A confirmation of these sentiments is to be found in the negotiations initiated in 1548 by Cranmer for the union of the Protestant Churches . After first consulting Melanchthon the Archbishop wrote to Bullinger and Calvin suggesting union on the lines of the Augsburg Confession, with England as the Headquarters of the United Church .Strype says " They took such great joy and satisfaction in this good King (Edward VI ) and his establishment of religion , that the Heads of them - Bullinger , Calvin , and others - in a letter

to him (1549 ) offered to make him their defender , and to have bishops in their Churches as there were in England , with the tender of their service to assist and unite together" (Original Letters ; Parker Society Ed Bk. I pp17,23, 24, 25 ; Strype Cranmer Vol. II pp207-8). This advance was arrested by the Marian "retrogression " . Two similar advances were made in 1560 by continental protestants and by Calvin but owing to changes , constitutional and theological , the opportunity had passed ( Strype : Parker vol. II p 69 ) .

The crypt of Canterbury Cathedral was , however , in 1561 by permission of the queen , reserved for the French Protestants and since then the Primate of the Church of England has been their ex-officio superintendent . Prof. Claude Jenkins points out that there has been no intermixture of rites between the presbyterians in the crypt and the Episcopalians in the cathedral above but the office has remained ( The Reformation and the National Church in the Anglican Communion - Report of Church Congress 1928 Edit . edit. H.A. Wilson p. 56 ) Thus it is one of the paradoxes of ecclesiastical history that the only surviving presbyterian superintendent within the British Isles is the Archbishop of Canterbury !

Melanchthon also expresses no opposition to a reformed episcopacy " It is the work of the Governors in the Church to examine those called to the Ministry in their Churches, to

ordain ,to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction and to investigate the doctrine of the priests .Moreover , especially where there were no bishops it is necessary that some should be erected .Only , we hope that those who are now bishops should examine doctrine and take care that sound doctrine is faithfully passed on in the Churches committed to them : if they do this , no one should refuse them obedience " ( Consilium De Moderanda Controversia in Articulis Religionis Praecipuis ,Ad Gallos 1536 , Melancthon's Opera IV p 835 ; vide also Opera IV p758; and Op .I p 38 -Wittenberg Edition 1601 ) .

The fact that episcopacy has been retained in some branches of the Lutheran Confession is further evidence that the reformers had no bias against a reformed episcopate .

There were special problems in Scotland to be met in special ways.The chief zeal of the party led by Knox was for reformation and it was to this task that he committed himself .Thus in the preface to the Buke of Discipline he writes " in the name of the Eternall God , as we will answer in his presence, to committ to writing, and in a Buke to deliver unto your wisdome oure judgement is the Reformation of Religion ,quhilk heirtofore in this Realme as in otheris hes bene utterlie corrupted " (Works of John Knox -Laing Edit. Vol. II p 184 ) .Both in England and on the continent Knox had been actively participating in the Reformation Movement but it was in the " realme " of Scotland that his primary task lay .The reformed church had to be the church of its people ; its early organisation adapted to its times . There is

a great measure of truth in what Calderwood says , from his especial point of view " The Book of discipline was accommodat to the time , in some points ; and liberty was reserved to the posterity to establish a more perfect as you may see in Mr Knox his historie . That which was temporary may be discerned from that which they esteemed to be alterable , by some reason or respect alleged . And indeed , we may safely say , that the whole was recommended to be perpetually observed , except some few things , as the office of Superintendents , Exhorters , Readers and some other things whereunto they were forced , as they thought , through necessity ; the policie of the Kirk being so defaced before , in the time of Popery , that it could not be perfectly repaired in haste " ( Calderwood History 1708 p. 25 ) .

Whether Calderwood rightly interpreted the mind of Knox or not it is difficult to determine . There are clauses in the Book of Discipline which seem to point to a temporary conception of that office with which we are most concerned , that of the Superintendent : " Those men must not be suffered to leave as your idill Bishopis have done heirtofore ; neather most thei remane whaire gladiethei wald ; But thei must be preacheris thame selves , and suche as may mak no long residence in any one place , till thair Churches be planted and provided of Ministers , or at the leist of Reideris " ( Knox's Works p. 206 ) . On the other hand a period of at least three years is envisaged : " After that the Churche be establishit , and thre



yeirs be passed , we require that na man be callit to the office of  
 a Superintendent , who hath not two yeiris at the leist gevin  
 declaration of his faithful labouris in the ministerie of some  
 churche " ( Knox's Works op cit p 207 ) . It seems as if this  
 distinctive office was not only a forced experiment but essentially  
 rooted in the primitive tradition " And because it happeneth some-  
 tyme in the Churche of Christ , that when other remedies assayed  
 proffitt nothings , they must proceed to the Apostolicall rodd and  
 correction as unto Excommunication ( which is the greatest and last  
 ponishment belonging to the spirituall Ministeries ); it is  
 ordeyed , that nothings be attempted in that behalf without the  
 determination of the whole Churche : wherein also they must be ware  
 and take good heade , that they seme not more readie to expel  
 frame the Congregation then to receyve againe those in whome they  
 perceyve worthie frutes of repentance to appeare .Neither yet to  
 forbyd hym the hearinge of sermons ; which is excluded frame the  
 sacraments , and other duties of the Churche , that he may have  
 libertie and occasion to repent .Finally , that all ponishment ,  
 correction , censures , and admonitions , stretch no farther than  
 God's Wordse , with mercie , may lawfully beare " ( Knox's Works  
 Vol. 4 p. 205 ) Here we have the distinctive function of the Apostol-  
 ate which is to administer discipline .In 1561 as in many contempor-  
 ary episcopal systems this was a Scriptural function forsaken and  
 forgotten. But discipline is not merely negative ; it involves  
 positive action in the exercise of administration .

These two functions : the exercise of discipline and administration were the *raison d'etre* of the Superintendency .

That the influence of the Continental systems had some effect upon this conception there can be no doubt : in A'Lasco's " *Forma inaugurandi Ministros Verbi et Superintendentem ad Ministerium Ipsorum* " it has been noted by such scholars as Dr Mitchell that the Swiss superintendent had much in common with his Scotch counterpart ( Mitchell *The Wedderburns and Their Work* ) .There is p. 82 1867 Edit . an important distinction , the Swiss superintendent was to be the focus of Church discipline ; everything must be effected through him whereas the Scotch superintendent was not so much the centre of unity as the instrument of a unity expressed in the Council (Kuyper *Johannis a 'Lasco Opera* vol. II p 50 ff ) . In the Hessian Church Constitution of 1526 it is stated : " there will be considered as visitors those men whom our Prince with the Men Elected by the Synod ----- for this year , while the Church is not established " ( Richter's *Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* p 66 ) .This interesting parallel is but one of the many adopted by the Continental reformers, all of which , as Dr Macgregor suggests , would serve as models in the Scottish expediency .

In the Reformed Church of England Knox had been appointed by Cranmer and the Privy Council as " Northern preacher " at

Berwick .Here he was the chief instrument of the Reforming party whose fear of Tonsal , Bishop of Durham , was well founded .In Dec. 1551 he was appointed , by the Privy Council , one of the royal chaplains in ordinary .If there may be some doubt as to Knox's actual position in this scheme the functions of the chaplains , nevertheless , show an interesting light on the establishment of the Scottish Superintendency .There were to be six chaplains in ordinary; two to be present in Court , four absent in preaching , one year two to be in Wales , two in Lancashire and Derby ; next year two in the Marches of Scotland , and two in Yorkshire ; the third year two in Norfolk and Essex , and two in Kent and Sussex ( M'Crie Life of Knox 1905 p 40 ;Moffat The Presbyterian Churches p 54 ) .

Burnet says " these it seems were the most zealous and readiest preachers who were sent about as itinerants , to supply the defects of the greatest part of the clergy , who were generally very faulty " ( Vide T. M'Crie op cit.p.43 ) .These chaplains were also advisers on ecclesiastical polity e.g. Knox and the Black Rubric .Grafted then unto the episcopal system were these " itinerants " ; superintendents in all but name.One of the Superintendents , Willock , it is interesting to observe was Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk and later Rector of Loughborough .He was in the habit of coming north to visit , as Superintendent his district or diocese of Ayr and to sit as Moderator of the four General Assemblies of 1563, June 1564, June 1565 and July 1568 .He is the first and only incumbent of the

Church of England to attain the Moderatorial Chair ! (vide Church Unity Papers p 37 ) .

It was as an expression of authority that the Superintendency was a distinctive office. Knox complains of the episcopate as being the wrongful seat of authority " seeing that your Bishoppes ( who in matters of religion claime all auctorite to appertaine to them ) have by their sentence condemned me " ( The Appellation Laing mss 1845 vol. 4 p 470 ) .

Lord Eustace Percy makes an interesting observation in respect to the influences which moulded the later polity of Knox .He would not stress even the notable example of Wishart " but Wishart had gone to another school .In his European travels he seems to have visited the Swiss churches and he had translated their first Confession , that of 1536 .He was thus the first to bring to Scotland a version of the Reformation which was to appeal more powerfully to the Scottish mind , as indeed to the mind of all Western Europe , than either the 'low ' temperatures of the Lutheran church or the prudent compromises of Anglicanism ---- But to the day of his death he remembered Wishart , certainly as a spiritual model and perhaps also as a political warning .But he was also a man who had fatally misjudged the ripeness of an opportunity : and Knox , one thinks , never forgot that lesson .He was to use political alliances as Wishart had not dreamed of using them , but he was careful never to trust himself to them until they were

strong enough to be effective .When his time came he showed all Wishart's courage but he knew how to bide his time , even under the suspicion of faint-heartedness " ( Lord Eustace Percy John Knox Lond. 1937 1st Edit pp 26 and also p 43 ) .Could this prudent consideration have issued in the contemporary settlement of the Church of Scotland ? Were the superintendents to be part of a permanent settlement or were they but temporary officers appointed to meet the exigences of the situation ? Professor Cooper would assert that they were to be an instrument of authority until the papal bishops had passed from the scene .Bishop Wordsworth gives it as his opinion " Notwithstanding the argument of Dr M'Crie ,Principal Lee , and others to the contrary , a careful examination of the Book of Discipline throughout will show , I think , that Knox intended the institution of 'Superintendents ' to be permanent" ( Christian Unity Association Papers 1914 p 39 , Wordsworth Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian Unity vol. 2 p 498 ) .A modern scholar , Dr J.L. Ainslie on the contrary , feels that the Book of Discipline in using such phrases as " for this tyme " and "in appointing superintendents for this present " that this verifies the view that the office was merely temporary ( J.L.Ainslie The Doctrine of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16 th and 17 th Centuries Edin. 1940 p. 113 - ) .

The political considerations involved must not be

overlooked : the policy of the Estates as it met in 1560 was not entirely disinterested. Spiritual authority was necessary but the Anglican compromise was out of the question .The office of superintendent was more than a compromise , it was a necessity and as such ably suited its short day .To establish an episcopate at this time would have been impossible .It is true that three of the Roman bishops had become Superintendents but the Church was at this time struggling for success not succession .Parity of Ministers was equally impossible where authority was the ancillary to order ( Rait History of Scotland Lond. 1914 p. 140 ) .Dr Moffat explains " The superintendent had discharged some of the functions which fall to a diocesan bishop , although strictly speaking he was no bishop " ( James Moffat The Presbyterian Churches Methuen Lond. 1928 p. 52 ) . It seems clear that in fact the office was a reversion to the first stage in the evolution of the episcopate and capable of the same growth .Dr C.Warr asserts " but the Church of the Reformation as outlined by the First Book of Discipline was not presbyterian , as now we understand the term.It retained a hierarchy, and if the designation of bishop gave way to that of superintendent , the system set up was more episcopal than presbyterian , for it contained no presbyteries " ( Dr C.L. Warr The Presbyterian Tradition Lond. 1933 p. 390 ) . This writer also notes that " Mosheim's unbiased opinion is that the early Reformers did not intend to sweep away the episcopal

hierarchy, but to protestanise it and adapt it judiciously to the circumstances of the country .The ancient principle was reasserted - that bishop and presbyter were one and the same order " ( ibid ) .It would seem to Dr Warr that Knox did not disapprove episcopacy

" If his preference lay in any direction , we are assuming that they were towards Episcopacy and England " ( Warr op cit p 302 - ) There is , it seems , little direct evidence to guide us upon this question beyond the general attitude of the reforming circle within which Knox moved . We find Beza writing to him on one celebrated occasion " My Dear Knox , and other brethren, ( I would have you ) to remember that which is before your eyes as Bishops brought forth the Papacie so false Bishops the relicts of Poperie , shall bring in to the world.They that desire the Churches good and safety let them take heed of this pestilence " ( vide Calderwood p. 57 ) . The writer evidently felt a warning was necessary .In refusing the see of Rochester Knox makes no specific allusion to the office as such " What moved me to refuse , and that with displeasure of all men ( even of those that loved me best ) those high promotions that were offered , by him whom God hath taken from us for our offences ? Assuredly , the foresight of troubles to come " ( Eustace Percy p 55 ) . Perhaps , in this connection , we should keep in mind Bishop Wordsworth's opinion " the Episcopal Church at the present day is quite as near to the Church of Knox as is the Presbyterian Church " ( Wordsworth Christian Appeals vol. 2 p.619 ) .

John Erskine of Dun expressed the opinion that " Superintendents and Bishops are all one " ( Rait p. 141 op cit ) .This statement has a parallel in that of Bramhall who says " in High Germany all these ( the Lutherans ) have their bishops or superintendents which is all one " ( Bramhall Serpent Salve A.C.L. edit. vol. III p. 480 ) .Durel also states " Let no man tell me here that these superintendents are not bishops -----They have all that which is essential to the function of bishops , viz the power of ordination and jurisdiction " ( Durel View of Reformed Churches beyond the seas 1662 edit . p. 70 ) .Hall comments " What difference is here ----- but that good Greek is turned into ill Latin " ( J. Hall Works vol. IX p. 621 ) .

It is interesting to note that Joseph Winram , one of the superintendents who died in 1582 is described on his tombstone as " Bishop of the People of Fife " .

Perhaps it is to the judicious genius of Knox that we should assign the settlement envisaged in the First Book of Discipline .The time was not ripe for a final settlement; that in the nature of things was to be determined by others ( vide Mathieson Politics and Religion in Scotland vol. I pp300-309 ; Sage The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery Lond . 1695 pp105-117 ) Are we then to judge the Office of Superintendent as an Episcopal-Presbyterian Accommodation ? Before we can give a satisfactory answer to this question we must consider

# I. Method of Ordination



## 2. Function .

As an introduction to a discussion of the 1560 " Ordinal " it is significant to observe that the letter written by the General Assembly dated Dec. 27 th 1566 on the question of the apparel controversy bears the title " The Superintendents , with Other Ministers and Commissioners of the Church of God in the Kingdome of Scotland , to their Brethren , the Bishops and Pastours of God's Church in England , who profess with us in Scotland the truth of Jesus Christ " . The letter , both in address and content seems to equate the Scottish Superintendents and Ministers with the Anglican Bishops and Pastors ( Laing vol. 2 p. 545 ) . The letter was apparently written by Knox himself .

The title of the Ordinal is as follows : " The Forme and Ordour of the Election of the Superintendents , quhilk may serve also in Election of all uther Ministers . At Edinburgh the 9 th of March 1560 Yeirs , Johne Knox being Minister " .

The form consists of :

Sermon to contain four heads .

Necessity of Ministers and Superintendents  
 Impediments  
 Admonition  
 Liberty of Acceptance  
 Certificate of election and Si quis  
 questions to the people  
 questions to the elected

Further questions to the people  
 Admonition to the Nobility  
 Prayer of Benediction as follows

" O Lord , to quhome all power is given in heavin and in  
 eirthe , thow that art the Eternall Sone of the Eternall Father ,  
 quho hes not onely so lufit thy Kirk , that for the redemption and  
 purgatioun of the same , thow hes humilled thyself to the deyth of  
 the Croce ; and thereupon hes sched thy most innocent bluid , to  
 prepare to thyself a Spous without spott ; but also , to retain this  
 thy most excellent benefitte in memory , hes appointed in thy Kirk ,  
 Teichears , Pastores , and Apostles , to instruct , comfort and  
 admonische the same ----- we crave , as by thee our Lord and King ,  
 and onely Bishope , we are taught to pray , saying , Our Father ---

The prayer ended , the rest of the ministers , if ony be ,  
 and Elders of that Kirk present , in signe of their consents , sall  
 take the elected by the hand , and then the chief Minister sall  
 gif the benediction as follows

God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ , quho hes commanded  
 his Evangell to be preiched , to the comfort of his Elect , and hes  
 called thee , illuminat thee with his Holy Spirit , comfort and  
 strengthen thee in all vertuwe , govern and guyde thy ministry , to the  
 prayse of his Holy Name , to the propagatioun of Christis kingdome ,  
 to the comfort of his Kirk , and finally , to the plain discharge and  
 assurance of thy awin conscience in the day of the Lord Jesus ---- "

Last Exhortation to the Elected

We have made these divisions serve no liturgical purpose but rather to facilitate a comparison of the Order with the Ordinal of the First Book of King Edward the Sixth. Such a comparison is in many ways most suggestive :

Mandates of Estates vice King's Mandate  
Popular Exhortation :

Ordinal : " Good people , these bee they whome we purpose God wylling to receyve this day, unto the holy office of Priesthode " .

Order : " The pepill wer asked if they would have the said superintendent " ?

The questions

Ordinal : " The Archbisshoppe " Are you persuaded that the holy Scripture conteine sufficiently all doctrine , required of necessitie fir eternal saluacyon , through the faith in Jesus Christe " ?

Order " Believe ye not that the doctrine of the Propheits and Apostles , contained in the buiks of the Auld and New Testaments ,---- that in the same Scriptures ar contained all things necessary to be beleved for the salvioun of mankind " ?

Ordinal : The Archbissoppe : " Wil you deny al ungodlin esse and worldly lusts , and liue soberly, ryghteouslye , and godly in thys world , that you may shewe yourself in all thinges an example of good workes unto other , that the aduersary maye be ashamed , hauynge nothing to laye agaynst you " ?

Order : " Will ye not contein yourselfe in all doctrine within the boundes of this foundation ? Will ye not study to promote the same , alsweill by yoir lyffe as by your doctrine ? Will ye not , according to the graces and utterance that God sall

grant unto you , profess , instructe and mantane the  
purity of the doctrine , contened in the sacred  
Word of God ? And , to the uttermost of your pwer ,  
will ye not ganestand and convince the gaynsayers and  
teichers of mennis inventions " ?

Dr Frere has shown that the compilers of the Edwardian Ordinal  
had before them Bucer's Ordinal of 1549 and that " While they reject-  
ed Bucer's doctrinal standpoint , they accepted much of his plan "  
( Procter and Frere History of the Book of Common Prayer Chap. on  
the Ordinal ) .It has been considered doubtful whether this was  
indeed the case as the draft De Ordinatione legitima ministrorum  
ecclesiae revocanda was not published until included in Bucer's  
Scripta Anglicana of 1577 ( W.K. Firminger Liturgy and Worship p671 ) .  
Bucer seems to recognise three orders of " presbyters and curates "  
viz . the order of bishops , of presbyters , whom the ancients used  
to call cardinals who governed the Church in places in which there  
were no bishops , and those assistant presbyters who " amongst us are  
called deacons " . For the ordination of a " superintendent , that is  
bishop " , he advised that the rite should be tempered ( attemperatur )  
and be fuller and graver than an ordination of a presbyter of the  
second order , and that " some distinction " should be made between the  
ordination of a presbyter of the second order and of the third order.  
( Liturgy and Worship p 672 note ) .Bucer's draft was therefore tend-  
ered as a revision of the First Edwardian rite for the ordering of  
priests, altered so as to make it available for the ordination of  
bishops , priests and deacons .

At this juncture we should do well to bear in mind the fact that in 1562 a scheme for reforming the Anglican Church in accordance with Presbyterian principals was lost in Convocation by one vote only ( Maitland Mod. Hist . vol. 2 p. 590 ; Macphail The Presbyterian Church p. 236 ) .Clearly in England the position in regard to episcopacy was fluid ; might not this have had some bearing upon events across the border ?

Further comparisons are illuminating : In Knox's Ordinal the words of commission occuring after the elected has been "taken by the hand " are said by " the chief Minister "

God , the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ , quho hes commanded his Evangell to be preiched , to the comfort of his Elect ,and hes called thee to the office of a Watchman over his peple. Multiply his graces with thee , illuminat thee with his Holy Spirit , comfort and strengthen thee in all vertue ,governe and guyde thy ministry .

This crucial phrasing can be compared with Bucer's

Manus Dei omnipotentis , Patris Filii et Spiritus sancti ,sit super vos , protegat et gubernat vos , ut eatiis , et fructum vestro ministerio quam plurimum afferatis , isque maneat in vitam aeternam .Amen

In refusing the Imperative of the Edwardian Ordinal the Order of the Book of Discipline and that of Bucer are one ( Forbes Irenicum Amatoribus Veritatis et Pails in Ecclesia Scotiana - Amstelaedami 1703 Vol. I Chap. XI pp 361 et seq . ) .

Of the 1552 Ordinal Knox says : " The whole order of your booke appeareth rather to be devised for upholding of massing priests than for any good instruction which the simple people can

receive thereof .Your sacraments were ministered for the most  
 part without soule , and be those to whom Christ Jesus was no  
 true minister ( Liturgy and Worship p. 665 ) . It was this high  
 conception of the ministry which dominated the mind of Knox ; it  
 was a raison d'etre of reformation. When he asserted in the  
 famous words " for albeit the Apostollis used the imposition  
 of hadis , yet seeing the miracle is ceased , the using of the  
 ceremonie we juge is not necessarie " he seems with Bucer to  
 substitute authority for authority " Other ceremeonie than the  
 publict approbatioun of the peple , and declaratioun of the chieff  
 minister , that the persone thair presented is appoynted to serve  
 that Kirk , we can nott approve " ( vide The Christian Ecclesia  
 1900 edit . Hort p 216 ; Wilson op cit p 168 ) . Thus whilst a  
 ceremony of commission was essential , the apostolic authority could  
 be delegated in such a manner as was most fitting to the  
 Church . We must note that Knox said that the laying on of hands  
 " we juge is not neccsarie " implying thereby no furious denunciat-  
 ion ( Laing's Knox Vol. II p. 193 ; J.L. Ainslie op cit p167 ff ) .  
 To the contemporaries of Knox whether nobleman or peasant the  
 laying on of hands had certainly ceased to be a wonderful thing ;  
 illegitimate scions of court favourites had been ordained to  
 rapacity , adultery and oppression . Holy heads had devised nefarious  
 schemes for the downfall of the righteous . It was not that the  
 apostolic Succession was nonsense to Knox ; rather it was too  
 wonderful a thing to be delegated by any mechanical means . It was

the doctrine of authority that permeated the theology of Knox and especially that of the ministry .That , as expressed in the Order , involved the authority of a threefold call : that of the inward man , that of the Church , and that of the people .The Imposition of Hands was not neglected because Knox held an abnormally low estimate of the Apostolic succession but rather because he held an abnormally high view .Perhaps it was in the last years that he realised the time for this sublimity was over , a succession depending on the clamour and wrangling of many voices was perhaps too subjective ; might there not be soon a time to remember the serenity and objectivity of the old episcopal mechanism ?

Gradually the Imposition of Hands was restored to the ordinals not only of the Church of Scotland but also to those of the reformed churches on the continent ( J.L.Ainslie op cit p 179 ) .

The Functions of the Superintendents were well defined .They were to :

- 1.Plant and erect Churches .
- 2.Preaching : " Thei must be preacheris themselves " .
- 3.To Ordain ( " as the former Ordour prescribeth " ) .They were to " set ordour and appoint ministeris " .
- 4 .To exercise authority ; " examyn the life , diligence and behaviour of thair Churches , and the maneris of the people "
- 5.Organise poor relief " Thai must further consider how the poore be provided".
- 6 .Establish Education : " how the youth be instructed " .

7. Exercise discipline " thai must admonishe whaire  
admonition neideth , dress suche things as by good  
connsall thei be able to appease ; and finalie , thei  
must note such crymes as be haynouse ; that by the  
censure of the Churche the same may be corrected " .

8 . Make visitations " but after that thei have  
remained in thair chief ton thre or four monethis at  
most , thei shall be compelled ( onles be seikness  
onlie thei be reteaned ) to re-enter in visitation , in  
which thei shall not onlie preache , but also examyn  
the life , diligence , and behaviour of the Ministers ;  
as also the ordour of thaire Churches and the manners  
of the peple " .

9. They " must not be suffered to leave as your idill  
Bischopis have done heirtofore " .

10 They were to " be desposit " if negligent .

( Knox's Works pp202-5 ) .

There were to be ten dioceses corresponding approximately to  
those of the pre-Reformation Church and the Superintendents were to  
make their residence in the principal town of the see :

1. Orkney - Kirkwall
2. Ross - Ross
3. Aberdeen - Aberdeen
4. Argyll - Argyll



5. Brechin-Brechin
6. St Andrews- St Andrews
- 7 . Edinburgh - Edinburgh
- 8 . Jedburgh - Jedburgh
9. Glasgow - Glasgow .
- 10 Dumfries - Dumfries .

In June 1562 the subjection of ministers to superintendents , as far as receiving "admonition " was clearly enacted. In December of the same year " the superintendent received the power , with the consent of the majority of the ministers in his district , to translate ministers. In 1565 his function increased vitally ; he might then call a disobedient minister before himself , accompanied only by the nearest discreet ministers , who might suspend the delinquent from ministry and stipend until the next General Assembly " ( Osmund Airy & Prof C.A. Briggs Art Presbyterianism Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol. XIX p. 680 9 th Edit ) . Three years after Knox's death in 1572 it was ordered that the superintendents be elected yearly " to avoid ambition " . In commenting upon this Dr Moffatt observes " by 1580 the General Assembly began to prefer presbyteries to the limited autocracy of superintendents , and by 1590 the final step of creating presbyteries was taken . So the office of superintendent waned before the rising sun of presbytery . It had been an interesting experiment . The superintendent

had discharged some of the functions which fall to a diocesan bishop. There is no sufficient evidence for the hypothesis that the Church intended them to hold office until the bishoprics fell vacant. Once presbyteries were organised, a superintendent was soon felt to be superfluous; indeed, his office appears to have been a temporary makeshift - one of those special measures which a Presbyterian Church is free to make, in virtue of its flexibility, for some immediate ends of efficiency" (Moffat op cit p 54 ff)

In actuality only five superintendents were appointed. These supervised Lothian, Fife, Angus & Mearns, Glasgow and Argyll. The secular lords were not yet sufficiently enlightened to provide financial support for the struggling church (MacCunn John Knox pp 106-7). The state of the Roman hierarchy at this time shows us the magnitude of the problem of ecclesiastical reconstruction. There were thirteen Scottish dioceses, four were vacant, Caithness was held by Lord Robert Stewart, bastard of James V and a lay postulant; Beaton of Glasgow had left for Paris never to return. The seven remaining bishops included three favourable to the reformation, Bothwell of Orkney, Hamilton of Argyll, Hepburn of Moray. There were enough Protestant bishops to ordain new colleagues but there was no authority who could appoint and this question of authority raised constitutional as well as theological issues (Percy op cit p. 338). Can we not say therefore that in view of this the function of the Superintendent was an episcopal

one - of dire necessity ? It is interesting , in this connection , to see how these functions took on a more episcopal aspect with the enactments of 1562 , 1563 .Hence as Calderwood records of the "assembly's Commission of Inquiry on the Episcopate of 1575 " next ye see they strike note **only** at the office of a Bishop , but also of a Superintendent : for the great affinitie that is betwixt them . And indeed by procefs of time , the like inconveniences would have followed the office of Superintendents , if it had continued , as was like to follow upon the office of Bishops " ( Calderwood op cit p69 ) .

We cannot close this portion of our inquiry without reference to the offer of Innocent XI made through Christopher Ropjas de Spinola , Titular Bishop of Tina ( Croatia ) and later Bishop of Neustadt who had conferred with Molanus in 1683

" The Pope will be pleased to confirm and hold as valid the ordinations hitherto performed by Protestants and to do this in a way which will be acceptable on both sides , will not prejudice either party and will be calculated to set the faithful at rest , as far as possible , touching the administration of the Sacraments ----- and he shall confirm and recognise as true bishops all Protestant Superintendents , who shall be

summoned together with the Roman Catholic Bishops to the General Council and shall sit and vote freely in the same , not as a Party , but co-ordinately with the Roman Catholic Bishops as competent judges " ( vide Art G.J.Jordan Reunion Proposals - Old and New A Historical Comparison Review of the Churches New Series Vol. VII no I Jan. 1930 p. 114). While the excessive sanguinity of Spinola seems to have aroused doubts in Leibnitz's mind it seems clear that the former's death in 1695 ended a period of great possibilities . Whether or not the Papacy would have gone so far as suggested in Molanus' Private Thoughts the fact remains that it has never since been so liberal ( G.J. Slosser Christian Unity Lond. 1929 pp 68-72 ) .

We may conclude , therefore , that oversight of some sort was a necessity in 1560 . The Superintendent seems to have exercised limited episcopal functions .He was not ordained in the Hierachy .Succession from England and from the surviving two pre-Reformation bishops was owing to the peculiar circumstances of the Scottish Church , impossible .Whether the conception of 1560 could have and was meant to develope into a regular Episcopate in orderly succession is a matter for speculation . That the order was succeeded by the Episcopate of 1572 is significant .Perhaps we may say , with some reservations , that

it was an initial attempt to establish a constitutional episcopate expressing the authority of the Assembly Court which as the Superintendency was an episcopacy in embryo , was Presbyterianism in utero . ( J.R. Fleming The Story of Church Union in Scotland -Its Origins and Progress 1560- 1929 London 1929 p. 21 ) .

What effect has this attempted "accommodation " of the Superintendency on the problems raised by contemporary movements for unity amongst the churches ?

The office of Superintendent might well be the basis for a return to constitutional episcopacy on the part of the Church in Scotland and other non-episcopal churches .Dr Moffatt asserts :  
 " But the most resolute Presbyterian may confess that in one respect a presbytery is less efficient than a single presbyter invested with episcopal ( though not hierarchical ) powers ,and that is , in cases where a presbyter has to be dealt with for unbecoming conduct .The parity of presbyters may be good and true , but when a fellow presbyter , incurs some guilt , and a scandal has to be dealt with , there is a natural reluctance on the part of his fellows to take action .Here a Father in God has an influence and authority , due to his position , which gives him the right to move ---- But we lost that when we lost the superintendent's office in the sixteenth century development of the Church " ( Moffatt op cit p 53 ) .

This opinion of an eminent Presbyterian scholar has in a general sense been commended by his contemporaries as shown in the Report of the Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will.

Another distinguished scholar and former Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland has a complementary opinion :

" In other respects a dash of Presbyterianism is perhaps a very desirable addition to an episcopal polity which sometimes tends to become prelatical .The episcopal system , if it works out in the form of few bishops retaining great and autocratic powers tends to become official rather than paternal .The presbyterian element in Church government , if it were ever to be grafted onto the episcopal , would not destroy episcopacy , but would either greatly increase the number of bishops , or insist upon a considerable devolution of authority . In neither case would the essence of the episcopal system be touched " ( Bishop K.D.

MacKenzie The Case For Episcopacy S.P.C.K. 2 edit 1929 pp91-120 ) .

It is significant to see how the increase of the episcopate has been advocated in many quarters as a condition of re-union. A representative scholar of the Church of England says " If our hopes of a United Church are realised in this country within the framework of Episcopacy , there must be in any case be an increase in the number of Dioceses; let us see to it then that they are true units of at-one-ment " .In this thesis we are reminded that

this multiplication of the hierarchy is not only to secure a devolution of prelatical authority but also to assist in the reestablishment of the contact of the bishop with his people - an essential reason for the establishment of the Order of Superintendent ( Dr W.J.Phythian Adams The Way of At-One-Ment S.C.M. Lond.1944 p.121 ).

The Baptist Union began the appointing of General Superintendents, who number ten , in 1915 .Mr Seymour J. Price points out that at their regular meetings the Baptist General Superintendents are presided over by a layman " in the same way although from a somewhat different angle , that the Bishops were presided over by a layman , one Thomas Cromwell , Earl of Essex , as Vicar -General of Henry VIII ; the Supreme Head of the Church of England " ! ( Seymour J.Price Laymen and Reunion Baptist Union Publications Board 1931 p. 4 ) .

The Methodist Church has Separated Chairmen of Districts whose work will correspond , when the scheme is fully operating , to the proposed office of permanent moderator of Synod .Strangely enough the Church of Scotland has viewed the appointment of permanent moderators with some misgiving .Thirty-four presbyteries indicated general approval , four had no objection , seventeen thought it undesirable , nine were non-committal and one was divided ( Report of the Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis May 1944 p. 7 ) .As in 1560 it was realised " it would entail considerable expense " although strangely enough the example of the sister church in its modern appointments of suffragan

bishops holding the incumbency of parishes seems not to have been cited . The functions of Permanent Moderator of the Synod correspond to a remarkable degree to those of the Superintendents and no doubt will be seen to be no more than the duties involved in a constitutional episcopacy .

It is most significant that the Congregational Union of England and Wales have used a system of superintendency since 1917 and with all that denomination's tradition of independency has found it of the utmost value .

It might well seem that the office of supervision drawn up in the First Book of Discipline might well be , in future years, the basis for Episcopal-Presbyterian Accommodation and for a yet wider unity .



## Chapter II The Tulchan Episcopate

---

The declining powers of Knox and finally his death removed from the scene one who was the dominant figure in the brilliant pageant of Scottish history .If the sword of the spirit be mightier than the sword of steel we cannot question this claim .But there was no sudden exit to the wings ; the curtain drops but slowly to divide the era of Knox from all that follows . The transition from the age of Knox to that of Melville is the turning point of the history of Scotland .

What was the state of things at the beginning of the second stage of inquiry which could be assigned to the date of the Convention of Leith in 1572 ?

It was a time of utter discord .The administration of the Earl of Mar as Regent failed to perform anything but the most perfunctory acts of government .The Reformed Church had doubtful legal standing ; the Superintendents had no authority save that of spiritual oversight - a power only exercised at the caprice of the nobility .All that was established was the " pure religion " of 1560. Here it is that we have to consider a point of some constitutional importance .Prof. Trevelyan has pointed out how different was the development of the Parliamentary system in Scotland from that in England . In the former government through the three estates had not undergone the mutation so swiftly effected by the English Parliament of

59 .For good or ill there was no " Tudor despotism " in Scotland to force a definite supremacy of the Commons over the Bishops in the Upper House and the clergy in Convocation which was the process resulting in the Act of Supremacy and the final settlement of the Anglican Reformation .Thus the Reformation in England was a lay revolution carried out by Crown and Parliament - more specifically by Crown and Commons - against the will of the Church authorities . Thus Parliament became the monitor of a Church established on mediaeval lines leaving little opportunity for the laity other than in Parliament to exercise control over it ( G.M. Trevelyan History of England pp 395 , 399-400 , 476 , 479 & 481 ) . In Scotland the absence of a strong monarchy acting as mentor produced a state of things far different .This constitutional difference has had a profound influence upon the polity of the Church of Scotland .Initially the new forces of awakening democratic spirit were helpless against the strong powers of those who had established themselves .When at last the flood-gates were opened all retarding influences were swept away .These were opened not by the monarchy but by the Church and the Church was a mentor who taught deeper doctrines .As Prof. Rait has said : " The General Assembly made possible the existence of public opinion in Scotland , and the public opinion of Scotland was with the Assembly " ( Rait The Scottish Parliament 1901 p 67 ) .

The period , therefore , under review , is concerned with the attempts made to effect a settlement in the Church to meet the immediate situation previous to the opening of the floodgates in 1581 . In succeeding generations many attempts were made to close the gates opened by the persistence of Melville but they stand open .

The successive administrations of the regency were confronted by a constitutional dilemma directly involving ecclesiastical polity .It was the opinion of Bishop Sage that " The Lords thought it expedient that the Ecclesiastical State should sit in Parliament and therefore were eager to restore Bishops , that their acts might be valid " ( The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery Examined p195-8 ) .Cook states " At the Reformation it was esteemed dangerous to make any great innovation upon the political constitution then existing , and although the Roman Catholic Bishops were prohibited from teaching , and were in fact deprived of their right to exercise their clerical functions , they were permitted to retain the privilege of sitting in Parliament , and many of them regularly attended its deliberations .In progress of time several of them died , and as there was no possibility of continuing the succession , the sees remained permanently vacant , and there was a near prospect of the total extinction of the spiritual branch of the legislature . The persons who success-

ively administered the government of James , contemplated, with much anxiety and alarm , an event which might be attended with consequences fatal to the throne of their sovereign .They dreaded that if , under the reign of a minor , one of the Estates ceased to exist , their proceedings might be afterwards declared illegal , and the whole of those interesting regulations by which the liberty and religion of the great mass of the people were intended to be secured might be set aside " ( Cook - History of the Church of Scotland Vol.I pp 167-8 ) .

The ratification of the prevailing order by the Parliament of 1567 was apparently of doubtful legality . Three of the Roman bishops had become Superintendents and Queen Mary conferred the See of the Isles upon another Superintendent .She had never sanctioned the Acts of 1560 ,but after her fall in 1567 the Parliament, acting in accordance with the wish of the Church , gave legal authority to the Superintendents .Those resolutions had depended upon the supremacy of the *lex reginae* .Others \* reasoned , that whatsoever authority was in the Kingdom was derived from her , and was revocable at her pleasure \* ( Spottiswoode Hist. of the Church of Scotland Edin . Vol. 2 p. 83 ; Rait op cit . p.140 , Calderwood op cit p. 43 ) .

It would seem that there was a genuine anxiety to secure stability in Church and State without which the incoherent process of constitutional degeneration would continue .Knox in his last days seemed acutely aware of this ( Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland Part I pp 199-200 , Bannatyne's Memorialis 1836 pp 91-103 , Calderwood op cit p 61 ) .Erskine of Dun writing to the Regent in a letter dated Nov. 10 th 1571 says " A greater offence or contempt of God and his Kirk can no prince do than to set up by his authority men in spirituall offices as to create Bischops and Pastours of the Kirk , for so to do is to conclude no Kirk of God to be ; for the Kirk can not be without it have the own power , jurisdiction , and libertie , with the ministrations of such offices as God has appointed . In spreading this touching the libertie of the Kirk , I mean not the hurt of the King or others in their patronages of presentation according to the laws , provyding always that the examination and admittance pertain only to the Kirk of all benefices having cure of souls " ( Memorialis p. 197 ) .Writing from Leith on Nov. 15 th the Regent replies : " The default of the whole stands in this , that the policie of the Kirke of Scotland is not perfect , nor any solid conference among godly men who are well willed and of judgement how the same may be helped ; and for corrupsions which daily increases , whensoever the circumstances of things shall be well considered by the good ministers that are neither busy nor over desirous of

promotions to thame and thairs , it will be found that some have been authors and procurers of things that no guid policie in the Kirk can allow " ( Memorialis p 197 ) .

It would seem , therefore , that the Convention of Leith was a result of genuine anxiety to establish constitutional order : " it would secure the maintainance of the Spiritual Estate in Parliament in a seemly way " ( Lord Balfour of Burleigh The Rise and Development of Presbyterianism in Scotland p. 60 ) .To men like Erskine political stability would be the means of ecclesiastical peace ; to the Regent Mar ( of whom Calderwood said " the maist cause of his death being that he loved peace and could not have it " ) it was ecclesiastical stability that would be the means of political peace ( Hume Brown History of Scotland p151 )

That there were other less worthy influences at work history has not been slow to acknowledge but even the nefarious schemes of the Tulchanists were dependent upon a stable ecclesiastical polity ( Calderwood p. 55 ) .

There is little doubt that the Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation envisaged by the Convention of Leith , whilst not disinterested , was an attempt to establish stability without which neither Church nor State could hope to prosper .It is this element of " quietness , love and

peace among all men " which then and always is necessary to a united Church . Although the " episcopate " of 1572 was short lived may we not say that the ideal stands out all the brighter because of the spiritual and secular wrangles which have for so long obscured some , at least , of the motives which gave it birth ?

The second reason for the accommodation of 1572 has been stated : " It would bring the Church of Scotland into closer conformity with the Church of England " ( Balfour op cit . p. 60 ) .In this again we trace a statesmanship which hardly seems compatible with much of Morton's character.It is the opinion of Hume Brown that " His own appetite for riches was unbounded , and from the mine before his eyes he was not the man to withhold his hand ; but , as the course of his policy shows , he was also guided by higher motives than merely selfish ends .Like Maitland and Moray , he steadily looked to the eventual union of the Crowns of England and Scotland ; and , as a necessary step towards this union , and a condition of its realisation , he regarded it as indispensable that the Churches of the two countries should be one in polity and doctrine . By word and deed , therefore he impressed on the Protestant ministers that their assemblies were mere conventions of his Majesty's lieges , and that they

must humbly accept whatever settlement the Crown might choose to arrange for them " ( Hume Brown op cit pp152-3 ) . Hence Morton seemed to have made the issue plain to many ; from now on Episcopacy was **Byzantinism** ..

It must be borne in mind , however , that had Morton's design accentuated the spiritual significance of a closer approximation to the Anglican settlement he would not have been without more enlightened support ( vide Lord Bacon Of the Pacification of the Church -Works Vol. I p.

351 ) .It is not until 1583 that we find a definite instance of the relationship between the settlement of 1572 and the Church of England: Patrick Adamson , Archbishop of St Andrews, was sent as the young king's representative to the Court of Queen Elizabeth . His assignment was to take " sure cognition of the ecclesiastical policy of that country , and to report the same to His Majesty at his return , that he might frame the Kirk of Scotland " ( Historie of King James the Sext Bannatyne Club Edin . 1825 p. 205 ) .To Melville , episcoporum exactor , " he practised with the Bishops for conformity , and gave them dextra societatis ; he dealt for learned preachers to be placed in the best situations of Scotland , knowing well the best men of the ministry of Scotland were to be displaced " ( vide Calderwood op cit p 154 ) .The Archbishop was apparently " received " by the Anglican hierarchy and was permitted to officiate in London ( J.P. Lawson The Episcopal



Church in Scotland Edin 1844 p 18 & p 193 ) .His biographer and son-in-law , Wilson , states that " by his eloquent preaching he drew after him such a concourse of people , and raised in their minds such a high idea of the young King , his master , that Queen Elizabeth forbade him to enter the pulpit during his stay in her dominions " ( vide Vit Pat Adamson , etiam Dedicat ...Oper per T. Wilson , Mathieson vol. I p 300 and Church Unity Papers p 47 ) . As he lay dying an urgent summons reached him from Bancroft , apparently with the goodwill of Archbishop Whitgift , to seek refuge with the Anglican prelates .It is interesting to note the contrast between the Queen's reception and that accorded by the Anglican prelates.

The question may well be asked whether the accommodation attempted by the Convention of Leith would have , in the course of time , been recognised by the Church of England ( It is of some interest to see how in the official documents of the time the Anglican and Titular Bishops were certainly equated ; vide The Border Papers ed Joseph Benson H.M. General Register House , Edinburgh 1896 Vol. II pp 316 & 390 .The signatories to the Treaty of Carlisle May 5 th 1597 include the Bishop of Durham and " Peter by the mercie of God bishop of Dunkell --- " ) .That doughty episcopalian ,Lawson ,tells us that Bishop Keith" is severely censurable

for inserting those men in the episcopal succession of the Sees in his catalogue of Scottish Bishops " ( Lawson op cit p 133 ) . He would take small comfort in the fact that they are still retained in the modern tables of succession ( vide Crockford ) .

During Melville 's detention in London in March 1607 the Presbyterian leader was sent by the Privy Council to Bancroft .The recorded interview is most illuminating:  
 " I am sure we both hold and keep the true grounds of religion, and we are brethren in Christ , and so should behave ourselves one towards another .Our difference is only in the governing of the Church and some ceremonies ; but I understand since you came from Scotland , your Kirk is almost brought to be one with our's in that also , for I am certain that there are constant moderators appointed in your General Assemblies , Synods and Presbyteries , even as I am highest under the King in this Church , and yet am nothing above the rest of my brethren the Bishops but in pain and travel ; so that I was in a better estate when I was but Richard Bancroft , even as a standing moderator of that General Assembly , or as Mr Patrick Galloway , or such others are in Scotland : and in every Province and Diocese there is a Bishop , a Moderator of a Chapter , or a Presbytery , answerable all to the King " ( Melville Diary Wodrow Soc. p689)

The attitude of Bancroft at the 1610 consecrations seems to be significant in any consideration of the Tulchan Accommodation ( The Case for Episcopacy K.D.Mackenzie S.P.C.K. p. 86 ; Grub Ecclesiastical History of Scotland vol. 2 - p 282 ; H. Curteis Bampton Lectures 1871 p 66 ) .

The truth of the matter might well lie with the unrecorded aspirations of both the sinners and saints . When Herbert Curteis asserts in his Bampton Lectures of 1871 that the English Presbyterian party " naturally looked forward , with hopes raised to the highest pitch of excitement , to the day now rapidly approaching , which should place a Scottish Presbyterian prince upon the united throne of both kingdoms " he was assuming that there was a definite Scotian Presbyterian polity residing either in the heart of prince or people previous to James I 's assumption of the English throne in 1603 ( Bampton Lectures op cit p66 ff ) .It is true enough that in 1580 the Assembly passed the resolution

" Foreasmuch as the office of a Bishop as it is now used..... within this realm hath no sure warrant ----- out of the Scriptures of God , but was brought in by folly and corruption of man's invention ----- ordained all such persons as enjoy --- the said office to quit and leave off the same " but this act , the great triumph of Melville was only passed by a

majority of one ! Thus there was to be in the future a " moderate " and a " high-Flying " party in the Church ( James Cooper, Reunion - A Voice from Scotland p. 16 ) .

Whatever may be the doctrinal laxity involved , whatever may have been the apparent supremacy of secular over the spiritual polity , it was an effort to establish a Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation although it was a time when the full Presbyterian polity was hardly a defined polity ( Botfield's Original Letters vol. I p 245 Gladstones to King James April 18 th 1610 ) . As Mosheim asserts the attitude of the Convention was to " protestantize the ancient hierarchy, and adapt it judiciously to the circumstances of the country ; but by no means to sweep it away as a Popish encumbrance which must impede and discredit a scriptural faith " ( Mosheim 's Institutes of Ecclesiastical History Stubb's Edit. Vol. III p. 68 ) At a time too when those who had to define the Episcopate of the Anglican Church were dominated by an Act of Supremacy formulated by a secular authority .In this state of flux might there not have been a hope that the two policies would coalesce , for the saints to the glory of a heavenly kingdom ; for the sinners to the glory of an earthly ? Since 1572 this hope has constantly been expressed and its influence has now become predominant among motives for reunion between the national churches .

Another reason for the accommodation of Leith was that it would enable the work of superintendence of the " particular " flocks to be carried out more systematically : it was hoped that it would secure the considerable remains of the old episcopal revenues for Church uses , for the abbacies and priories were now becoming hopelessly secularised ( Lord Balfour op p 60 ) . Does this mean that the superintendency had proved ineffective ? Just how far the Titular bishops supplanted the Superintendents is of some importance to this inquiry .

The General Assembly in ratifying the proposal for the Titular Episcopate met in the Tolbooth of Perth on Aug. 6 th 1572. Knox , still at St Andrews was unable to attend but wrote to the Assembly entrusting his note to the hands of Winram and Pont ( Bannatyne's Memorialles p 236 ) . In it he urged that " all Bishoprics vacant may be presented , and qualified persons nominated thereunto , within a year after the vaiking thereof , according to the order taken in Leith by the commissoners of the nobility and of the Kirk in the month of January last " ( Booke of the Universall Kirke of Scotland , Pt I p 248 ) .No pensions of benefices were to be allowed without consent of the legal possessor , the superintendent or commissioner of the district or " of the Bishops lawfully elected according to the said order taken at Leith " ( J.P.Lawson op cit p 118 ; Booke of the Universalle Kirke p 248 ff ) .Knox to the last pronounced no

general anathema on the accommodation of 1572 ( This general attitude of Knox may be compared to that of Calvin as ably demonstrated by the researches of M.J.Pannier Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 1926 pp305 - 335 ) . With this in mind we are enabled the better to examine the functions assigned to the episcopate .Of the six ministers representing the Kirk , John Erskine , Superintendent of Angus , John Winram , Superintendent of Fife , Andrew Hay , Commissioner of Clydesdale , David Lindsay , Commissioner of the West , Robert Pont , Commissioner of Orkney , and John Craig , one of the ministers of Edinburgh , there was only the latter to oppose the lawfulness of the episcopal function in the church at the inquiry of 1575 ( Spottiswoode p 172 ) .

The convention finally reported :

1. That the archbishoprics and bishoprics presently void should be disposed **to** the most qualified of the ministry .
2. That the spiritual jurisdiction should be exercised by the bishops in their dioceses.
- 3 . That all abbots , priors , and other inferior prelates , who should happen to be presented to benefices , should be tried by the bishops or superintendents of the bounds , concerning their qualifications and aptness to give voice

for the Church in parliament , and upon their collation, be admitted to the benefice , and not otherwise .

4 .That to the bishoprics presently void , or that should happen thereafter to fall , the king and the regent should recommend fit and qualified persons and their elections to be made by the chapters of the cathedral churches . And fore - as much as divers of the chapter's churches were possessed by men provided before His Majesty's coronation, who bare no office in the Church , a particular nomination should be made of ministers in every diocese to supply their rooms until the benefices should fall void.

5 . That all benefices of cure under prelacies should be disposed to actual ministers , and to no others .

6 . That the ministers should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese , and where no bishop was as yet placed , from the superintendent of the bounds .

7 . That the bishops and superintendents at the admission of Ministers should exact of them an oath for acknowledging His Majesty's authority , and for obedience to their ordinary in all things lawful , according to the form then condescended " ( Spottiswoode p 172 ) .

Of all the settlements of Church polity made since the Reformation the Tulchan accommodation may justly claim to be the most indig<sup>e</sup>nous . The solution

was an attempt to establish a polity not necessarily reflecting either Geneva or Canterbury. Indeed it did not . That it did not succeed was due to the forces of disruption which can hardly be considered as native ( Moffatt op cit p 48 ) .

Calderwood remarks : " And therefore the Bishops , admitted according to this new order , were called in jest , Tulchan bishops . A Tulchan is a calfe's skin stuffed full with straw to cause the cow to give milk . The Bishop had the title , but my Lord got the milk or commoditie . Yet in this Book , no farther power is allowed to Bishops or Archbishops than before to Superintendents " ( vide Lawson op cit p 126 ) .

It is clear that a period of transition was contemplated when both bishops and superintendents would be exercising office e.g. " That the ministers should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese , and where no bishop was as yet placed , from the superintendents of the bounds " ( vide Book of the Universall Kirke of Scotland Pt I pp 237-242 ; Spottiswoode p 190 ff ) . The other offices of the ministry were integrated in the same way .

The titulars appointed as a result of the Convention of Leith were Douglas of St Andrews and James Paton of Dunkeld . John Porterfield was nominated Archbishop



of Glasgow but succeeded within a year by James Boyd .Bothwell possessed Orkney and Caithness was held by the "lay " Titular , Stewart . Dunblane was not filled until 1574 when Andrew Graham was appointed .Aberdeen had no Titular until the death of Bishop Gordon in 1579 when David Cunninghame was appointed . Moray was filled in 1573 when George Douglas was nominated .The See of Brechin was held by Alexander Campbell ; and Leslie of Ross, though one of the overthrown hierachy and absent in England , was undisturbed in the nominal possession of the See which he retained till his death in 1596 .

Apparently no titular was appointed to Galloway and an appointment after the death of John Karswell to the Isles is doubtful.The position in regard to Argyll is also obscure but it seems certain that there was no appointment until that of Neil Campbell in 1580 ( Booke of the Universalle Kirke pt.I p 270 ; Lawson op cit p 126 ) .It would seem,therefore , that for several years the episcopate had of necessity to be supplemented by the superintendency : " It thus appears that only a few Titulars were considered necessary to represent the defunct Spiritual Estate in Parliament " ( Lawson ibid ).In the Edinburgh General Assembly of August 1573 paton of Dunkeld was among others of the episcopate subject to a complaint that he " had received the name of a Bishop ,but they had not heard

that he had used the office within his bounds " .To this he replied that he " had lately received the Bishopric , and that there was a Superintendent continued in that bounds till this assembly " ( Booke of the Universalle Kirke Pt I p 270 ) . It is interesting to note that provision was made for a " Suffragan " for the Titular of St Andrews in Lothian ( ibid p280 , 283 ) .Commissioners , were ordered , at this same Assembly to be in all provinces where Bishops were not placed ( ibid ) .That the relation of the Titular to the Superintendents is one of equality is seen from the resolutions of the Commission appointed on March 14 th 1574 .It was declared that the jurisdiction of Bishops in their ecclesiastical function shall not exceed that of Superintendents , which they previously had and still have " .Like them they were to be " subject to the discipline of the General Assembly as members therof " ( Acta Parl Scot . Vol. III p 89 ) .The Titulars were also prohibited from collating to any benefice within the bounds of the Superintendents withoutv their written consent , and even the consent of three well qualified ministers was necessary before appointment to parishes within their own limits .At this same commission Erskine , Spottiswoode and Winram resigned their office as Superintendents ( whether they were asked to continue is not clear ) .Previous to this the Assembly of Mar . 6 th 1572 enacted that " Winram was to use his own jurisdiction as before in the provinces not yet subject

to the Archbisopric of St Andrews , and requested to concur with the said Archbishop , when he requires him in his visitation , or otherways within his bounds , until the next General Assembly ; and in like manner the Superintendent of Angus and Lothian to continue in their jurisdiction in manner foresaid , without prejudice of the said Archbishop , except by virtue of his comaision " ( Book of the Universall Kirk pt I pp 237 -42 ) . When financial arrangements were still in a state of chaos a complaint was answered " The Superintendents were no better used , the means allowed to them for their service being withholden : and when they complained they were answered that their office was no more necessary , bishops being placed in the dioceses , and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction belonging to them " ( Spottiswoode p 196 ) .

In 1574 Robert Pont demitted office of " commissioner " for that diocese when George Douglas was admitted Bishop of Moray ( Acta Parl Scot Vol. III p 89 ff ) .

Thus the transition from the one government in the church to the other was a gradual one accomplished or apparently meant to be accomplished over a period of years .

The functions of the Titulars was clearly that of the Superintendents .The one important exception. was that they as Lords Spiritual formed part of the Estates and as such were part of the constitutional machinery .Thus we find that

the Assembly of Oct 24 th 1578 enacted : " That they vote not in parliament in the name of the Kirk without permission of the Kirk ; that they claim not to themselves the titles of the Lords Temporal , neither usurp temporal jurisdiction , whereby they are abstracted from their office " ( Acts of the General Assembly Vol.I pp208 -206 Book of the Universalle Kirk Pt 2 p 434 ) .This complaint whilst defining the " usurped " offices of the Lords Spiritual indicates the tension existing between the old out-moded constitution and the new forces voicing their aspirations through the only medium open to them - the General Assembly .From the Assembly of April 24 th 1576 we find that the complaints against the Tifulars indicate that their functions were much the same as those of the Superintendents . The Titular of Glasgow was indicted for not " preaching in the town of Glasgow since he entered in his office, and also rarely preaching , howbeit he was thought diligent in visitation " and that he " had no particular flock " . This latter charge against Boyd indicates the trend which was for establishing the episcopate on regular monarchical lines . The Bishop argued that " he received no particular flock in the entry of his office , nor no question was moved thereupon ; but if the "ssembly think that he should be astricted to a particular flock , he should either obey the ordinance of the Assembly therein , or give

place to others " At the same Assembly the Superintendent of Lothian was accused of "initiating " the Titular of Ross in the Abbey of Holyroodhouse though "admonished " by the brethren not to do it ( Booke of the Universalle Kirk Pt I pp 331-347 ) .

The organisation of the dioceses was to be on pre-reformation lines : " The names and titles of Archbishop and Bishops be not innovated nor yet the bounds of the diocese confounded but stand and continue in time coming , as they did before the reformation of religion ; at the least till the King's majority, or consent of Parliament .That there be a certain assembleie or Chapter of learned ministers annexed to every Metropolitan Cathedral seat . That the Dean , or failing the Dean , the next in dignity in the Chapter , use the jurisdiction in spirituals , as the Bishop might have used , during the time of vacancy . That all Archbishops and Bishops , that shall be admitted hereafter exerce no faryer jurisdiction ,in spiritual function , than the Superintendents have and presently exerce , till the same be agreed upon ; and that all Archbishops and Bishops be subject to the Kirk , and General Assembly thereof , in Spirituallibus , as they are to the King in temporalibus , and have the advice of the best learned of the Chapter , to the number of six at the least , in the admission of such , as shall have function in the Kirk ; as also that it be allowed to as many others of the Chapter as please to be present at the admission

and to vote thereat " ( Calderwood op cit p 51 ) .Where , " diverse of the Deaneries , and other dignities and benefices , called cannonries and prebendries , in Metropolitan and Cathedral Kirks , were possessed by persons , that have not made profession of the true religion , nor yet have entered by the lawful order of the true reformed Kirk , in the function of the ministry : and therefore not meet to give vote in the election of the Bishop ; there is an order set down , which shall be observed for the interim , twenty -one ministers are nominated to be the Chapter ----- and so many of the old Chapter as live , and are ministers , shall still be in the Chapter , during their natural lives " ( Calderwood p. 53 ) .The old pre-reformation offices then were to be retained . Glasgow was to have a Chapter of Thirty- two " founded upon distinct and several benefices " . The Pastor of Hamilton was to be Dean , the Parson of Kilbride the Precentor , the Parson of Campsie the Chancellor; Treasurer , the Parson of Carnwath ; Sub-Dean , Parson of Cader and Monkland and there were appointments as Arch-deans of Glasgow and Teviotdale .The relationship of the Titular to the General Assembly was similar to that of the Superintendency of 1560 ( vide Acts of the General Assembly Vol.I p 246 ) . Thus the accommodation had , for brief moment effected a grafting of an episcopate on to the Superintendency which after all was a reasonable process . Cook states : " the episcop-

al polity which issued from the Convention appears to have been admirably calculated for securing an useful and efficient clergy . It established an excellent system of control ; it enforced upon ministers the regular discharge of their pastoral duties ; it assigned peculiar province to all holding benefices ; allotted a moderate provision for their support and comfort , whilst it subjected the highest dignitaries to restraints which guarded against the indolence or the profligacy that had disgraced the Bishops under the Popish establishment " ( Cook History of the Church of Scotland Vol I pp 187-8 ) .

The "consecration " of the Titular bishops was apparently similar in form to that of the " admission " of the superintendents ( Knox's Works Vol. II p192-4 ) .We say " apparently " because evidence is scanty but there seems one important difference : the imposition of hands once more found a place in the commission . Calderwood describes the process of election . :

" Upon the twenty -eight of Januar , the Earle of Mortoun went to St Andrews , and caused affix an edict upon the Kirk door and Abbey gate , upon the Lord's day the third

of Februar , warning the persons appointed to represent the Chapter , to bein St Andrews , the Sixth of Februar , upon which day Mr John Douglas , Rector of the Universitie , gave a proof of his gift by preaching in the Kirk of St Andrews . Upon friday the eight of Februar , Mr Patrick Adamson discontented , because he was not preferred to a Bishoprick , as he expected , relying upon the Clerk of Register's moyen , in his sermon divided Bishops in three sorts , My Lord Bishop , My Lord's Bishop and the Lord's Bishop . My Lord Bishop , said he , was in time of Paistrie : My Lord's Bishop is now , when my Lord getteth the fat of the benefice , and the Bishop serveth for a portion out of the benefice , to make my Lord's fare . The Lord's Bishop is the true Minister of the Gospel " ( Calderwood op Cit p 55 ) . There may be some doubt about these famous definitions but definitions they are ! ( Lawson op cit p 112 ; James Melville Diary p 25 . Mackenzie Lives of Scottish Writers Vol. III p 365 ) . Calderwood continues : " A Great debate there was at the election , but in the end the Rector was chosen ; notwithstanding that many of the Ministrie opposed . Mr Knox being then resident at St Andrews , and preaching upon the Lord's day the tenth of Februar , the Earl of Mortoun being present , he denoun-



ced anathema to the giver , and anathema to the receiver ; as I find in a certain manuscript " . This manuscript is not extant and the only evidence is that of Bannatyne ( Memorialles pp 223-4 ) . Cook comments : " That he was not influenced by the idea that Episcopacy was at variance with scripture is evident from the communication which he within a few months made to the Assembly at Perth , and from the part in the ceremony taken by the Superintendent of Fife ( Winram ) one of his confidential friends " ( Cook op cit Vol. I pp187-8 ) . The protest of Knox , if genuine , would seem to have been due to his stern resolution that never again should the secular forces , not all friendly to the reformation settlement , dominate church polity . Calderwood describes how " After sermon , the Superintendent of Fife went up to the pulpit , and had a short exhortation , which being ended he observed the order , which was used in the admission of Superintendents , demanding the same questions , and the Rector Mr John Douglas answering , having his answers written on paper . Mr William Cock bailif of St Andrews answering in the name of the people . Thereafter , the Bishop of Caithness , Mr John Spottiswoode , Superintendent of Lothian , and Mr David Lindsay , that is , the person representing the Archdeacon of Lothian , and the Chancellor sitting with the Rector upon a form before the pulpit , layd their hands on him , and embraced him , in signe of admission " ( Calderwood ibid ) .

Dr Cooper points out that beyond the act of preaching at the consecration of " his old friend and fellow labourer " no other part in the service was open to him ( Knox ) ; he had never been a superintendent , and to the superintendents , as virtual bishops along with the pre-Reformation Bishop of Caithness ( whose consecration , however , is uncertain ) , the Agreement assigned the Act of Consecration " ( J. Cooper Reunion A Voice from Scotland Lond . 1918 p 13 ) . A similar form of consecration to that of Douglas seems to have taken place in the case of David Cunningham to Aberdeen in 1577 ( Chronicle of Aberdeen 1491-1593 Walter Cullen Vicar of Aberdeen Spalding Club Miscellany Vol. 2 pp46-47 ) . Prof Cooper also points out that in 1572 Adam Bothwell of Orkney , an undoubted bishop , took part in the consecration of Robert Boyd of Trochrig , minister of Glasgow , to the Western Archbishopric ( Christian Unity Papers p 52 ; vide also Book of the Universall Kirk p 340 ) .

How did the Titular Bishops define their office ? At the Edinburgh Assembly of Oct . 24 th 1578 Boyd , Archbishop of Glasgow , defined it thus : " First I understand the name , office , modest reverence borne to a Bishop to be lawful , and allowable by the Scriptures of God and being elected by the Kirke and King to be Bishop of Glasgow , I esteem my calling and office lawful . As it respects my execution of that

charge committed to me , I am content to endeavour at my uttermost ability to perform the same , and every point thereof , and to abide the honourable judgement of the Kirk from time to time of my offending by my duty , craving always a brotherly desire at their hands , seeing that the responsibility is weighty , and in the laying ( anything ) to my charge , to be examined by the canon left by the Apostle to Timothy , ( I Tim. III ) because that portion ( of Scripture ) was appointed to me at my receipt ( induction ) , to understand therefrom the duties of a Bishop . As towards my living , rents , and other things granted by the Prince to me and my successors for the securing of that charge , I reckon the same lawful . As to my duty to the supreme magistrate , in assisting his Grace in Council or Parliament , being summoned thereto , I consider my position as a subject compells me to obey the same , and that is no hurt but beneficial to the Kirk that some of our number are at the making of good laws and ordinances . In the doing whereof , I protest before God I intend never to do anything but what I believe shall stand with purity of the Scripture and a well reformed country , for a good part of the revenue I enjoy has been given for that cause " ( Booke of the Universall Kirk Pt II p 423 ; Spottiswoode p 256 ) .

In this connection it may be as well to reflect upon the wholesale alienation which was part of the corruption existing in the pre-Reformation Church .The old episcopal stipends were not entirely devoted to spiritual purposes ; in any case the **hierarchy** formed the backbone of the " civil service " . Whilst this cannot excuse the " milking " it certainly does leave one with the impression that there was more to be said for the Tulchanate than many a superficial judgement would allow . It is clear that the old **hierarchy** conveyed much away from the Church : the old houses surrounding the beautiful little cathedral of Brechin still bear their ecclesiastical names ; these together with all the land endowments were conveyed by individual members of the Chapter into lay hands and such acts ratified ( D.L Black History of Brechin p 302-5 ) .

Adamson 's definition of his office seems no less clear . As much in the confidence of James as anyone was likely to be he had , as we have seen , been sent as representative to the English Court ( Mathieson Vol. I p 292 ; Historie of King James the Sext Bannatyne Club Edin 1825 p205 ) .

No doubt he was as succesful as a man could be although there are other opinions .James Melville alleges that in his propositions presented to the French Kirk and Geneva his object was to " make us and our discipline odious to the Queen and Kirk of England " ( Diary Wodrow Soc. p I43-54 ) . In the propositions the Titular maintains " The government of the Kirk does consist in the authority in power of the bishop , to whom is committed the diocese and provinces in government .The office of a Bishop is of the apostolic institution , and most agreeable to the primitive purity of the Kirk of God . The ordination and ordinary judgement of pastors belong to the Bishop , without whose authority whosoever does presume to the pastoral cure enters not at the door but over the wall ----- Presbyteries to be appointed of gentlemen , or lords of the soil , and others associated with the ministers , are no other but to induce a great confusion in the Kirk , and an occasion of continual sedition " ( vide Lawson op cit p I9I ) .These propositions were sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London .Whether these propositions were genuine or not is a matter for some speculation but Andrew Melville 's presence in London in 1585 resulted in " the banished ministers of Scotland had certified some of the Council and Prelates of England hereof , so that the man ( Adamson ) was the less regarded in his negotiations " ( Diary ppI4I-44; Lawson op cit p I90 ) .Perhaps James ' interpretation of the acts of 1584 ( probably written by Adamson , the King was not

yet twenty ) provide a more true definition of what the Leith Accommodation was meant to be : " My Bishops , who are one of the three Estates , shall have power as far as God's word and example of the Primitive Kirk will permit , and not according to the Man of Sin's abominable abuses and corruptions ----- I allow not a Bishop , according to the traditions of men , or inventions of the Pope , but only according to God's Word ; not to tyrannize over his brethren , as to do anything of himself , but with advice of his whole diocese , or at least with the wisest number of them , to serve him for a council , and to do nothing by himself alone , except the teaching of the word , ministration of sacraments , and voting in Parliament and Council " ( Calderwood op cit pp193-6 ; Christian Unity Assoc Papers p 53 ) .

Thus if we conclude that the Convention of Leith was an attempt at Presbyterian-Episcopal Accommodation we must admit reservations . In the first place a full Presbyterian polity had not yet been effected ; in the second place , the episcopate was not directly in succession to the old hierarchy . If it was no true episcopate it did attempt a policy of assimilation to the Church of England by which

doctrinal deficiency might , in the course of time , have been rectified whilst safeguarding a constitutional method of church government. Such an element of spiritual democracy was and is the Church of Scotland's contribution to the future United Church of Great Britain . Had not the times been against it , this unity might have been effected in better circumstances than in 1610 ( H.A. Wilson op cit p 170 ) . The original reformers , Knox and Erskine , were not opposed to a constitutional episcopate . It was a really Scotian and native attempt to settle a church polity which was foiled by a Genevan settlement advocated by Melville . It would seem too that the "Tulchan" aspect of the accommodation has been unduly stressed. The Titulars , were in the main , men with theological as well as financial aspirations and amid much vilification this should not be forgotten .

It is clear that the Leith settlement has not received the attention it has deserved . As in the South India Scheme the recent appeal of the Archbishop has envisaged a period wherein the constitutional episcopate could be adopted and tried by the non-episcopal churches . At the end of that period or during it, the succession could , under safeguard , be communicated to the non-episcopal uniting church as an act of "friendly brotherhood " . Might this not have been the ultimate result of the Leith agreement of 1572 had it been allowed to continue ? As has

recently been stated " In the Church , the household of God , the Bishop should represent in his own appointed area the principle of Fatherhood . An assemblage of persons cannot be a " father in God " ; and the lack of this element is an impoverishment of the Church's spiritual life . The Bishop should always exercise oversight as a father , not " as lording it over the flock " ; and the individual man who holds the office of a Bishop , should never forget that he himself is a sheep of Christ's flock who needs as much as any the benefit of pastoral care " ( Doctrine in the Church of England Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed 1922 Publ.1938 Lond. 123 ) . Perhaps 1572 has taught us that both the sister national churches can well agree on this ( Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.S.C.M. Lond. 1942 p. 40 ) .

To some,however , the period under review offers a salutary warning : " It is indeed gratifying to Episcopalians to know that the necessity of Episcopacy in any conceivable scheme of re-union is generally recognised ; but we should be wise to wait a great deal longer for the coming of reunion if the interval can be used for the growth of a theological , and



not merely a pragmatic , agreement upon Episcopacy. The phenomenon of 'titular ' bishops , which appears in sixteenth - century Scotland , offers a salutary disencouragement to the alternative policy ; they , indeed , were not consecrated , but they had the name and many of the functions of Bishops , and consecration divorced from any theological interpretation of the episcopal office would quickly sink to the status of a technicality " ( Eric Graham , Bishop of Brechin , Truth , Unity and Concord . London 1948 p 72 ) . As against this , the burden of our observations is that the Tulchan Episcopate failed because the convenience was not allowed , by purely secular forces , to develop into a conveyance by which the new politics would have amalgamated with the Anglican tradition .

### CHAPTER III

---

#### THE AGE OF MELVILLE

The age of Melville if not marking the birth of Scotch Presbyterianism at least brings it to its first strong youth. Henceforth it was to grow into a maturity little weakened by the assaults of spiritual disease or secular buffetings .

Boyd , titular Archbishop of Glasgow , was elected Moderator of the General Assembly of March 1575 , the year in which Andrew Melville had returned from the continent : " In the Church this year began the innovations to break forth that to this day have kept it in a continual unquietness .Mr Andrew Melville , who was lately come from Geneva , a man learned ( chiefly in the tongues ) , but hot and eager upon anything he went about , labouring with a burning desire to bring into this Church the presbyteral discipline of Geneva ; and having insinuated himself into the favour of divers preachers , he stirred up John Dury , one of the ministers of Edinburgh , in an Assembly which was then convened , to propound a question touching the lawfulness of the episcopal function , and the authority of chapters in their election .He himself , as though he had not been acquainted with the motion , after he had commended the speaker's zeal , and seconded the purpose with a long discourse of the flourishing estate of the church of Geneva , and the opinions of Calvin and Theodore Beza concerning church government , came to affirm ,' That none ought to be esteemed

office - bearers in the Church whose title of bishops , albeit the same was found in Scripture , yet was it not found in the book of God .And for the title of bishops , albeit the same was found in Scripture , yet was it not taken in the sense that the common sort did conceive , there being no superiority allowed by Christ amongst ministers ; He being the only Lord of his Church, and all the rest servants in the same degree , and having the like power ' . In end he said , as unless the same were removed it could not go well with the Church , not could religion be long preserved in purity " .So runs the able paraphrase of Melville's contribution to that assembly . From now on his influence was to be solely effective ( Book of the Universalle Kirk Pt I p 231 ; Lord Balfour of Burghleigh op cit p 62 , Spottiswoode p 200 ) .

Andrew Melville was a man whose like has rarely appeared on the stage of history . " whilst dispossessed by temperament of the scholarly serenity associated with Erasmus he had many of that great man's gifts . Born in 1545 he passed his early days in the little wind-swept town of Montrose . Here Erskine of Dun had persuaded Pierre de Marsilliers to introduce the study of Greek into Scotland . With this early scholar's help he became a child of the classics . At St Andrews he was " the best poet , philosopher and Grecian of any young master in the land " and little must he have known that one day his power at Latin epigram would bring upon him the ire of a king . In 1564 , at the age

of nineteen , he entered the University of Paris .Here he studied a number of oriental languages and attended the lectures of Turnebus and Ramus ; this latter had a profound influence upon him especially in respect to educational matters in which Melville was always interested . Teaching was his life and his downfall .Even Kings do not like to be in continual tutelage .From Paris he went to Poitiers in order to undertake the study of Civil Law and at the age of twenty-one was made a regent of the college of StMarcean . After three years he left France owing to the eclipse of the Huguenot ascendancy .He found asylum at Geneva where through the influence of Theodore Beza he was appointed to the Chair of Humanity at the Academy( M'Crie Life of Andrew Melville Vol.I p 67 ) . Dr Janet Macgregor has shown how close was his connection with the leaders of the Reformed Churches on the continent ( J.G.Macgregor The Scottish Presbyterian Polity pp102-3 ) . In Geneva he must have become acutely conscious of the need for Protestant solidarity in view of the growing strength of reactionary forces .This must have been brought home to him by the events of 1572 . That year witnessed the massacre of St Bartholomew and Geneva became the City of Refuge .Melville's thirst for knowledge was insatiable ; undisturbed by Scotian wrangles he had the opportunity of intercourse with the leaders of the Reformed churches and drank

deeply of their doctrine .When in 1574 he returned to Scotland he was appointed Principal of what had been Glasgow University.

In this year there were no students , the buildings were almost in ruins .Within six years students were flocking to its classes .In 1580 he performed similar service at St Andrews where he re-organised the theological schools and established a strong interest in Hebraic studies which to this day has been the glory of the Scottish faculties .Following the Raid of Ruthven Melville was threatened with confinement or possibly death .In Feb. 1584 he fled to London where he remained until Nov. 1585 . Here for twenty months he had his first contacts with the Anglican Church in loco .On his return to his alma mater he continued to lecture his students , and in the striving world outside , his king .In 1606 he once again took the long journey to London " that his Majesty might treat with them of such things as would tend to settle the peace of the church " . His constancy , however , cost him four years in the Tower . On gaining his liberty he was banished from Scotland and ended the last eleven years of his life as a professor in the University of Sedan .He died there in 1622 at the age seventy-seven ( James Melville's Diary ; Wodrow Society Pp 141-4 ; vide M'Crie op cit ) .

Andrew Melville is a man of whom any nation can be proud . It is perhaps a sign of the times that Dr Moffatt in

in his useful volume " The Presbyterian Churches " finds no place for him in the general index and mentions him but twice ( pp 48 , 51 ) .His greatness surely lies in the recognition that while he was not so much a true child of Scotland as that he was a true son of his age .Born when books were being opened after a long period of closure he learnt with the avidity common to the early humanists .It is the zeal for education that characterizes the Humanist ; never was a man more zealous in this .As the old systems crumbled society was forced to adopt new legal systems to replace the Canon Law which had regulated pre- Reformation society . Thus another characteristic of the reformation scholars is their interest in law . Melville , as we have seen , was also influenced by this .The true Humanist sees in the individual an all sufficient grace to glorify God . There are degrees of Humanism but we cannot disregard its significance as a basic philosophy of the Reformation .If this is indeed the case can we not ascribe part of the Presbyterian settlement to this potent force ? Was it not an attempt to establish a polity where , under God , and under none else man should predominate ? But the interest in the new Law meant a deeper understanding of order .Hence

with the advent of Melville we find these two forces ably represented in the Presbyterian settlement as envisaged in the Second Book of Discipline .The system of Superintendency, whether meant to be permanent or not soon gave way to new developments . The Accommodation of Leith did not seem to exhibit the two necessary humanistic qualities i.e. that God's man and God's Law should predominate .In respect to the former , it was a mere accommodation forced on the unwilling Kirk by the caprice of a monarch and the greed of a nobility .Secondly it lacked the quality of order without which the authority of the evangel could not be proclaimed .These qualities of humanism were to find their doctrinal expression in the work of Grotius .Both he and Melville owned Calvin as their master ; he stood in the same relation to them as Aquinas to those of the opposite school . Thus the principles upon which Melville acted were logical , consistent and above all expressive .Thus the Presbyterian settlement was moulded by the hands of men children of an age . Its virtues are obvious : it bred independence , a sturdy constancy , the democratic spirit , a pride in scholarship , a system of law and order expressed through the Church Courts .Its defects are now in this age of wondering reflection no less



prominent ; it was too objective and thus provincial , it forced the pace of settlement , it became too legalistic and thus intolerant .Viewing these things from afar we can see little of the hurryings and wranglings ; only the deep surging movements sweeping through the heart and mind are dimly discerned .It is surely to these forces rather than to the accidental qualities of church polity that we must look for the reasons of Melville's great triumph and contribution .

When Andrew Melville returned to Scotland in the July of 1575 Beza had written to the General Assembly " that the greatest token of affection the Kirk of Geneva could shew to Scotland was , that they had suffered themselves to be spoiled of Mr Andrew Melville , that thereby the Kirk of Scotland may be enriched " ( Calderwood p 77 ff ) .Whatever apprehension the Regent may have had about the sudden appearance of a new prophet he secured him as a domestic chaplain : " First he tried men of the best gifts at Court ; and if he found they would serve his purposes , his intention was to advance them to Bishoprics . Howbeit Master Andrew was not acquaint with his intentions ; yet was he not willing to serve at Court , but rather to be a Professor in some University .The reason , says Calderwood : " His ( the regent's ) intention was to have him

and his gifts framed to his purpose , that is , to restrain the freedom of application in preaching , and the authority of General Assemblies ; and to bring into conformitie with England in the Church Government , without which he thought he could not govern the Country to his phantasy , or that agreement could stand long between the two countreys " ( Calderwood p 66 ) .It was a proposal , at least worthy of a statesman however worldly ; the like was exhibited in Morton's settlement of the Reidswire Affray ( Diurnal of Occurrents pp 348-9 ) .

How is it that the advent of one man could have so changed the church polity of Scotland ? We have seen how the Convention of Leith was in part dominated by constitutional motives ; it is the protest of the reformers , however , that they were unwilling to exchange regal for papal authority and in that were logical .Of the Kirk " Jesus Christ , was its only Head and King " ( vide Second Book of Discipline ) .Accommodation ,however statesmanlike , could not be tolerated by the exponents of the stern logic of Geneva . The all too human arrangements of the Tulchanate stood no chance .It has been demonstrated how the leaders of this phase of the history of Scotland's Church were influenced by contact with the continental reformers ( Macgregor p 35 ) .These contacts were still maintained and some would be influenced more than others .Even the prelate Adamson " wrote very craftily to Geneva and Tiguria , and sent them propositions and questions

desiring to have their judgement " ( Diary , Wodrow Society p141 ) .  
 Melville was the living catalyst whose presence enabled the  
 formation of a solid body of opinion from something which had  
 previously been nebulous and vague .

The Edinburgh Assembly of 1575 had answered John Dury's  
 propositions by appointing a committee of six to consider the  
 " lawfulness of the episcopal function ----- For the one part ,  
 Mr David Lindsay , Mr George Hay , and Mr John Row were nominated .  
 These three sustained the lawfulness of the episcopal function  
 in the Church . For the other side , Mr James Lawson , Mr John  
 Craig , and Mr Andrew Melville were chosen to impugn the same "  
 ( Spottiswoode op cit p 200 ) . The conclusions were remark-  
 able :

1. First that they did not hold it expedient to answer the  
 questions proposed for the present ; but if any bishop was  
 chosen that had not qualities required by the Word of God , he  
 should be tried by the General Assembly .
2. That they judged the name of a bishop to be common to all  
 ministers that had charge of a particular flock ; and that by  
 the Word of God his chief function consisted in the preaching of  
 the word , the ministration of the sacraments , and exercise of  
 ecclesiastical discipline , with consent of his elders .

3. That from among the ministers some one might be chosen to traverse and visit such reasonable bounds , besides his own flock , as the General Assembly should appoint .
4. That the minister so elected might in those bounds appoint preachers , with the advice of the ministers of that province and the consent of the flock to which they should be admitted .
- 5 . That he might suspend ministers from the exercise of their office upon reasonable causes , with the consent of the ministers of the bounds ( Spottiswoode ibid ) .

The results of the commission at once show the influence of Melville but also at the same time , the moderating effect of Lindsay's inclusion together with that of Row and Hay . Was this merely a Gulimafree ? May not this too have been a genuine attempt at accommodation ? Scott comments : " They thought it not expedient to answer directly to the question for the present , because the Court was set for the state of bishops ; yet in their articles they make a bishop no bishop , because they tie him to a particular flock ; but this office of visitation also was after thought needless , where presbyteries were constituted . Observe here , also the superintendent is joined with the bishop , and the articles strike at both and both were removed to the door together " ( Scott Apologetical Narration Edin Wodrow Soc . 1846 p 24 ff ) . Calderwood also imputes the commissioner's moderation to " the Regent's authority " ( Calder-

wood p 69 ) . Such respect for authority is also attributed to the Archbishop of Glasgow , the Bishops of Dunkeld , Galloway , Brechin , Dunblane , and the Isles " all of them interested in that business . Yet neither were they called to the conference , nor doth it appear by the register of those proceedings that they did so much as open their mouths in defence of their office and calling " . Further : " It was no wisdom in them to have given way to such novelties , and have suffered the lawfulness of their vocation to be thus drawn in question " ( Spottiswoode p 201 )

The General Assembly of April 24 th 1576 held at Edinburgh witnessed complaints against three of the titular episcopate and the superintendent of Lothian . After depriving James Paton of the see of Dunkeld the Assembly " directed Mr David Lindsay and Mr Patrick Adamson to inform the Regent of their proceedings . They returned with this answer , that he could find no fault , that the Kirk had proceeded against him , and deprived him worthily for his offences : yet it was his desire that a set policy , and universal order be established in the Kirk , for such and other like proceedings , and to that effect , that such things as were peened in the last Conference upon that argument be reasoned and seen ; or that with force of the Council , if the heads ; or else themselves set down and devise the said policy , to be presented to his Majesty that laws may pass thereupon . In the

meentime , in case of the said Bishops complaint upon the Kirk to the Council , that some of the learned to be deputed by the Assembly , to attend upon the Council , and to reason the matter . In this answer , ye may see, the Regent giveth the Assembly their option , whether they will agree to the heeds concerning the policy penned in the last conference , or if with some of the Council they will make other heeds themselves , and present them , that laws may pass thereupon " ( Calderwood p 70 ff ) .

Thus the definition of a settled policy became a burning issue and to the settlement of this Melville bent all his energies .

The Assembly of April 1576 is also distinguished by the appointment of Visitors . The reason for inauguration is given : " Because the great and intolerable burden lying to the charge of Bishops , Superintendents and Commissioners of Countreys , is and hath been the cause , that all the Kirks within their bounds could not be duely overseen , and consequently good discipline was not exercised within the same for lack of Visitation ; therefore it was thought meet , that such bounds be appointed to every Commissioner and Visitor , as may be duely visited and overseen by every one of them .To the effect they appointed the Commissioners of Shires and Provinces and others joined to them , to convene at extraordinary hours , to make a proper division of the whole bounds of the Realme , and to give in writ their judgement how every bounds may be best visited .This was done , and the

Assemblie appointed , one , two , three or four for the limited bound , as they thought expedient " ( Calderwood p. 76 ) .The functions of the Visitor were :

1. That he call the rest of the ministers together within the bounds of his visitation .

2 . Hold Synodall Assemblies and be moderator .

3 . Try ministers .

4 .Have the oversight of schools ,( and he ) be tried by this Assembly .

5 . Propose matters that are to be consulted upon ; gather votes , and declare what is found by votes .

6 . Have the oversight of all particular kirks within the bounds of his visitation and of the ministry thereof.

7 .See that every one of the ministers exercise their own visitation diligently in their own congregations .

8 .In the bounds of his visitation , appoint ministers with advice of the ministry of the province assembled in the Provincial Assembly , at least , six of the best learned within his bounds , or that failing , of the next adjacent to be chosen in the Synodical assemblies , the cause being there tried ; particular intimation being made to his particular congregation to be present , except some urgent cause occur that it be necessary to do the same

with short advice , as if the minister commit some notorious crime , whereby he cannot longer be detained in his office , in which case the Visitors may convene them that are upon the exercise of that province , and they with him and the session of the particular kirk , proceed to suspension , after lawful trial .

9. Upon the presentations of Patrons to the Visitor , he , with consent of the Synodical Assembly of his Province , shall give Letters Testimonial to him that is presented , lawful impediments being taken away , at least with advice of six ministers within his bounds , or that failing , of the next adjacent , to be chosen in the Synodical Assembly providing alway , that the assent of the flock , where he shall appointed be had , or else a reasonable cause be shewed by them whereof not .

10 That all ministers be admonished not to proceed unadvisedly to excommunicate ; and if difficulty arise thereaunt that the Visitor and the rest of the country be advised with ; and sicklike , anent absolution.

11 Where there is not ecclesia bene constituta , that he travell to constitut it .

12 .That he take heed to the keeping of the exercise , repairing of Kirks and Kirkyards , designation of manses and glebes , and all other charges pertaining ad decorem



ecclesiae , and granted to the Kirk be the laws of the country " ( Calderwood p 73 ,Apologetical Narration p 36 ) .

The functions of the Visitor seemed to have been established in order to exercise an oversight which the Superintendency or Titular Episcopate had failed to provide. The new office certainly seems to have had the full support of the Assembly .In many ways the Vistor's function seems to represent a perfect mean between constitutional episcopacy and a full Presbyterian polity .As the latter gained support the Interim of Visitors naturally gave way to the Presbytery : " Notwithstanding all of all these cautions and limitations, it was declared by the Assembly holden in October 1580 to be a corruption , and to tend to tyranny , that such a kind of office as the office of visitor should stand in the person of one man , which should flow from the presbyteries ; yet because of the state of the time and lack of present order for establishing and constituting presbyteries , they suffered that office of visitors yet to stand " ( Calderwood ibid ) . The Interim of Visitors lasted from 1576-1581 . This period would seem to be of no little significance to our present considerations .

The Interim thereof , marks a period of devolution in the powers of the episcopate and the consequent

evolution of a full Presbyterian Polity .

The Assembly of April 24 th 1576 held in Edinburgh finally approved of the motions :

1. " The name of Bishop is common to every one , that hath a particular flock , over which he hath a peculiar charge .

2 . And to the effect the said articles , condescended unto by the said Assembly may be the better followed , and ready execution ensue thereupon , as appertaineth , the Bishops , who have not yet received the charge of a particular congregation , are ordained to condescend tomorrow , what particular flocks they would accept to take the cure of " ( Calderwood p 72 ) .

Calderwood further remarks : " Here ye see, that Bishops are now appointed to take charge of a particular flock ; and consequently are no longer Bishops . That they are no more but Visitors of other flocks ; that this office of Visitation is qualified and bounded with sundry caveats and conditions ; that the meeting of the Brethren for the Exercise of Prophecising have their interests in the affairs of the Kirk , before the Presbyteries were constituted and erected " ( Calderwood p. 72 ) . The enactments of the Assembly were not , however , entirely unanimous

In this connection it is of interest to observe the comment ;  
 " Bishops , Superintendents and Visitors , are in effect all  
 but Visitors , and of equal power or preeminence for the time ;  
 and yet even this power of visitation was not thought necessary ,  
 where the Kirk was well constituted " ( vide J.P. Lawson op cit  
 p 145 ) .

At the Assembly of April 24 th 1578 with Andrew Melville  
 as Moderator , the process of episcopal devolution was continued ;  
 " In the third session it was ordained , that all Bishops and  
 others bearing ecclesiastical function , be called by their own  
 names , or **Brethren**, in time coming " In the seventh session  
 " it was ordained as followeth : for as much as there is great  
 corruption in the State of Bishops , as they are presently set up  
 in this Realm , whereunto the Assembly would provide some stay in  
 time coming , so far as they may , to the effect that further  
 corruption may be bridled , the Assembly hath concluded , that no  
 Bishop shall be elected or admitted before the next General  
 Assembly , discharging all ministers and Chapters to proceed any  
 ways to the election of the said Bishops in the mean time , under  
 the pains of perpetual deprivation , and that this matter be  
 proposed first in the next Assembly to be consulted , what further

order should be taken therein " . The Assembly of the following  
 June 11<sup>th</sup> " all in one voice hath concluded, that the said act  
 shall be extended to all times to come , ay and till the corruption  
 of the state of bishops be utterly removed ; and that all Bishops  
 already elected , be required particularly to submit themselves to  
 the General Assembly , concerning the reformation of the corrupt-  
 ion of that Estate of Bishops in their person , which they refuse  
 after admonition , that they be proceeded against **by excommunication .**  
 The Bishop of Dunblane willingly offered his submission to the  
 Assembly " ( Calderwood p. 81-82 ) .

The " corruption " of the state of Bishops were defined  
 by the limitations of the Assembly of October 1578 :

1. that they be pastors and ministers of one flock .
2. that they usurp no criminal jurisdiction .
3. that they vote not in Parliament in name of the  
 Kirk without advice from the Assembly .
- 4 . that they take not up , for the maintainance  
 of their ambition and riotousness , of the emoluments  
 of the Kirk , which may be content with reasonable  
 livings according to their office .
- 5 .that they claim not to themselves the titles of  
 temporal lords , neither usurp temporal jurisdiction  
 whereby they may be abstracted from the discharge of  
 their office .

6. that they aspire not above particular Elderships ,  
but be subject to the same .

7 . that they usurp not the power of presbyteries .

8 . that they take not further bounds of visitation  
than the Kirk committeth unto them " ( Scott's  
Narration p. 38 ) .

The famous Assembly of Dundee which met on July 13<sup>th</sup> 1580  
further asserted " For as much as the office of a Bishop , as it  
is now used and commonly taken within this Realm , hath no  
sure warrant , authority nor good ground out of the Book and  
Scriptures of God , but is brought in by the folly and corruption  
of men's invention , to the great overthrow of the true Kirk of  
God , the whole Assembly in one voice , after liberty given to all  
men to reason in the matter , none opposing themselves in defence  
of the said pretended office , findeth and declareth the same  
pretended office , used and termed as is above said , unlawful  
in the self , as having neither fundament , ground nor warrant in  
the word of God ; and ordaineth , that all such persons , as brook ,  
or hereafter shall brook the said office , be charged simpliciter  
to demit , quit and leave off the same , as an office whereunto  
they are not called by God ; and suchlike to desist and cease from  
preaching , ministration of the sacraments , or using any way the off-  
-ice of Pastors , while they receive de novo admission from the  
General Assembly , under the pain of excommunicatuon to be used  
against them ; wherein if they be found disobedient , or contravene

this act in any point , the sentence of excommunication after due admonition to be exercet against them " ( Calderwood p90 ff ) .

This policy was implemented in the Synodical Assemblies , corresponding to the old diocese . It was further stated " In that they condemned the office of a Bishop , as it was then used and commonly taken within this Realme , they meant not to allow any other sort of bishop , either Anglicane or Romane , but only the Divine or Apostolical Bishop , who is only a Pastor of a particular Flock or Congregation , as may be seen in the articles agreed upon 1575 and 1576 years , and in the Book of Policie ..... Least any man should think that they damned not the office simpliciter , but the corruptions are the very essence of the office ; so that to abolish the corruption of the estate of bishops , is to be abolish the corrupt state of bishops " ( Scott Narration pp 55-90 ) .

The devolution of the episcopate was therefore effected in two stages :

1. By attacks on the temporal convenience of the Tulchan Episcopate .
2. By attacks on the doctrinal basis of episcopacy in any form .

( Scott ibid p 39 ) .

The order is significant as showing that Melville's policy would not have triumphed unless the accidental qualities of the Leith settlement had been so open to criticism . The succeeding

Interim of Visitors shows , that , at least , as far as administration goes , it was on firm ground .

Negative criticism , however , was seen to be but ancillary to the forces working against the welfare of the Reformed Church .The Assemblies of 1575-78 saw the need for a positive policy ( Acts of the General Assembly Vol. I pp 362 ,397 Vol. II p 409 ) .Events on the continent were casting their shadows upon the Scottish landscape .Philip , the great Lord of Reaction , was still a force to be reckoned with at home " Till past the year 1590 , one third of the Scottish nobility were Roman Catholic , as were the majority of the people in the counties of Inverness , Caithness , Sutherland , Aberdeen , Moray , in Nithsdale and Wigtown " ( Hume Brown History of Scotland p 168 ) .In the legal establishment of the Second Book of Discipline we again find the same dichotomy of purpose as actuated the Leith Settlement ; James saw it as but the means to his establishment in the English succession ; the Assembly saw it as a means to the final establishment of the reformed Kirk .That the spiritual and secular aims would ultimately conflict seemed more obvious to the latter .

The Committee appointed by the Assembly to deal with the definition of Church polity contained names which we have

seen were associated with a moderate policy of accommodation ( Acts of the Assembly Vol. I pp 35 , 20 , 12 & 75 , 384-5 ; J. Macgregor op cit p 106 ) . It may seem , however , that the Second Book of Discipline is the monument to one man alone , Andrew Melville , whose personality was dominant and decisive . Personalities such as that of Augustine and the strange vacillating personality of Cranmer had like effect on the Church of England .

In the General Assembly of April 1 st 1577 " It was thought expedient , that some of the Brethren should be directed to the Regent's G . to inform him , that the Assembly is travelling in the matter and argument of Policy " ( Calderwood p 77 ) .The Committee work finally ended in 1581 when the Second Book of Discipline was adopted and ratified by Act of Assembly ( Acts of the General Assembly vol. II pp 487-512 ) . Unlike the First Book of Discipline it was ratified by Act of Parliament ( Acta Parl Scot vol. III pp 541-47 ) .The adoption of the full Presbyterian polity was a gradual one : "Ye may see what pains were taken to search out the true and durable policie which ought to be established in the Kirk ; that it was not brought in rashly , without deliberation , but after many conferences and reasonings in publict Assemblies and other



meetings " ( Scott op cit p 46 ) .

The Second Book of Discipline was essentially an attempt to define a constitution and its doctrinal basis ( Spottiswood op cit p 235 ) . Defined under thirteen heads the first promulgated the Lordship of Christ , " only Head and King " of the Church .The second " Of the Parts of the Policy of the Church and Persons or Office - bearers to whom the Administration is committed " .The four ordinary offices of the Church were :  
 " the pastor , minister , or bishop , the doctor , the presbyter or elder , and the deacon " . The Third : " How the Persons that bear Ecclesiastical Functions are admitted to their offices " and asserts 2 The ceremonies of ordination are fasting ,prayer and imposition of hands of the eldership " . Fourth : " Of the office-bearers in Particular and first of the Pastors and Ministers : Pastors , bishops , or ministers , are they who are appointed to particular congregations, which they rule by the word of God , and over which they watch ; in respect whereof sometimes they are called pastors , because they watch over their flock ; sometimes ministers by reason of their service and office ; sometimes also presbyters or seniors , for the gravity in manners which they ought to have " . Fifth Head : " Of Doctors and their offices and of Schools " .The function of the doctor " different from the pastor , not only in name , but in diversity of gifts " was " to open up the mind of the Spirit of God in the scripture

simply , without such application as the minister uses " .Sixth  
 Head : " The Elders and their Office " .... The function of this  
 comprehensive office included those who were not " teachers of  
 the word " , was " to hold assemblies with the pastors and doctors ,  
 who are also of their number , for establishing good order and  
 execution of discipline " . Seventh Head : " Of Eldership, and  
 Assemblies , and Discipline " . This defined the Church Courts :  
 " Assemblies are of four sorts ; for either they are of a part-  
 icular congregation , or of a **province**, or of a whole nation, or  
 of all and divers Christian nations " . Eighth Head : " Of deacons  
 and their office , the last ordinary function in the Church " .  
 This was a financial office " for them to whom the collection  
 and distribution of the alms of the faithful and ecclesiastical  
 goods do belong " . Ninth Head : " Of the Patrimony of the  
 Church , and Distribution thereof " . Here the deacons were enjoined  
 to secure the maintainance of the Church by its endowments " .Tenth  
 Head : " Of the offices of a Christian Magistrate in the Church " .  
 The magistrates must defend the Church and its patrimony and "alth-  
 ough kings and princes that be godly , sometime by their own  
 authority , when churches are corrupted and all things out of  
 order , displace ministers and restore the true service of  
 God , after the example of some godly kings of Judah , and  
 divers godly emperors and kings also in the days of the New  
 Testament ; yet where the ministry of the Church is once well

constituted, and they that are placed do their office faithfully ,  
all godly princes and magistrates ought to hear and obey their  
voice , and reverence the majesty of God speaking by them " .

Eleventh Head : " Of the Present Abuses remaining in the Church ,  
which are desired to be Reformed " .This asserted the dissolution  
of the entire episcopal system including " deans , archdeacons ,  
chancellors , having the like titles , which flowed from the pope  
and canon law only and have no place in the reformed church " .Twel  
fth Head : " Special Heads craved to be Reformed" . This defined  
the method by which the church polity was to be implemented :

" Seeing the whole country is divided into provinces , and these  
provinces into parishes as to landward as in towns , in every  
parish and reasonable congregation there would be placed one  
or more pastors , and no pastor or minister be burdened with the  
charge of more churches than one " .The Thirteenth Head : " The  
Conclusion , showing the Utility that shall flow from this  
Reformation to All Estates " .Here the supremacy of the Reformed  
Kirk is asserted : " So to conclude , all being willing to apply  
themselves to this order , the people suffering themselves to be  
ruled according thereto , the princes and magistrates not exempted  
and they that are placed in the ecclesiastical ruling and govern-

ing rightly , God shall be glorified , the Church edified , and the bounds thereof enlarged , Christ Jesus and his kingdom advanced , Satan and the Kingdom of darkness subverted and God shall dwell in the midst of us to our comfort in Jesus Christ who with the Father and Holy Spirit abideth blessed in all eternity . Amen " . ( vide Dunlop " Collection of Confessions of Faith vol. II Edin. 1722 ) .

Thus the supervisory function implied in the offices of Superintendent , Bishop, and Visitor were supplanted by the new hierarchy of the Church Courts ; the General Assembly , the Provincial Synod , the Presbytery and Kirk Session ( Macgregor op cit pp112-26 ) .

Conditions for the implementation of this policy were not , at this juncture , favourable . It implied an unearthly harmony between Church and State which however successful in Geneva could hardly be so in the Scotland of this period .

Four months had hardly passed since the famous Glasgow Assembly of 1581 , a year also memorable for the death of Morton , when Lennox , his successor , challenged the new polity . In June of this year James Boyd , titular Archbishop of Glasgow , had died and the regent appointed James Montgomery ,

minister of Stirling , to succeed him . It was a Tulchan arrangement at its worst ; the prelate was to be provided with " One thousand pounds Scots with some horse , corn and poultry . The rest of the endowments were to be abstracted by the regent ( Hume Brown p 182 ) . Affairs were further clouded by the shadows of reaction . Arran , rival to Lennox , was a Protestant and saw that a reproachment with England was inevitable . Philip saw Scotland as a gateway to England . Recent research has shown the diligence of the papal agents in assisting this design ( Spanish State Papers Vol. 2 p 256 ; Mac Clean The Counter Reformation in Scotland p 47-61 ) . The Ruthven Raid , the fall of Lennox and the ascendancy of Arran brought new complications into the situation . In spite of " The Negative Confession " it was obvious that the constancy of James' advisers consisted only in furthering that monarch's aspirations to the English throne . In little else could they afford to be constant ; least of all to compromise the King by open devotion to either Rome or Geneva . The future was not yet and it was just with the probabilities of the future that they were most concerned . By the flight of Andrew Melville in Feb. 1584 it seemed that the voice of the Presbyterian party would lose much of its boldness .

On May 19<sup>th</sup> 1584 a Parliament met in Edinburgh . The King presided in person and Adamson , as Archbishop of St Andrews , was summoned from England to attend . Six other titulars were present . The acts were :

I. A ratification of the " liberty of preaching the true word of God , and administration of the Sacraments in purity and sincerity , according to the Confession of the Faith received and authorised by parliament in the first year of his Majesty's reign " .

2. The King's supremacy over all Estates and subjects within the kingdom .

3. Ratification of the authority of the three Estates of parliament , thus expressly sanctioning the Titular Episcopate .

4 . Prohibition of all jurisdictions not approved by parliament , and all assemblies and conventions held without the King's special licence .

5 . The preachers limited to their " own charges and vocation " , and they were not to intermeddle with matters unconnected with their functions .

6 . All to be fined or personally punished who uttered " slanderous and untrue calumnies against the King's Majesty , his Council , and proceedings , or to the dishonour and prejudice of his Highness , his parents , progenitors , crown , and estate " .

( Acta Parl Scot. vol. III p 290 ff ) .

It was obvious that with the fall of Arran , the prop and support of James , and the constant protests against the Acts would have to receive answer .But if Andrew Melville and the exiled ministers thought that they were to receive satisfaction they were mistaken .James seemed inexorable .In 1586 , however , he called a conference of " some appointed by the Council , and some of the ministry ' apparently ' such only as the King sent for " ( Calderwood p. 197 ) ,These ministers were obviously the " moderates " who genuinely wished to see the establishment of some form of accommodation .The mantle of moderation was not worn by Erskine and Craig alone ( Hume Brown p 202 ) . The chief points of the agreement were :

1. " The name of Bishop hath a special charge and function annexed to it by the word of God " .
- 2 . That his election shall be by a presentation directed to the General Assembly , from whom he shall receive his admission .
- 3 . That the Bishops were to be recognised as the moderators or presidents of the Presbyteries within their dioceses .
- 4 . That by the advice of these Presbyteries ,

and with the concurrence of the majority ,  
they were to admit or deprive ministers and  
receive presentations to parishes .

5 . That they were to reside and discharge the  
pastoral office at particular churches , and  
yet to visit within their own Dioceses ,  
though amenable for their morals and doctrine  
to the General Assemblies .

6 . New Presbyteries were to be constituted  
and Synods held twice in the year "

( Calderwood pp 197 -199 ) .

A second conference appointed to be held some ten days before  
the next Assembly does not seem to have taken place ( Lawson  
op cit p 209 ) . These of all the attempts at accommodation  
seem the most statesmanlike and deserving of note .

The reply of Andrew Melville to these proposals was  
heard in the following April when at the Provincial Synod of  
Fife held at St Andrews Adamson was excommunicated and .  
Melville dwelt upon the " corruptions of the human and Satanical  
Bishopric " ( Calderwood p 199 ff ) .

The General Assembly met , after an interval of  
two years , in the Tolbooth , Edinburgh on May 10 th 1586 when  
the King requested an adjournment until the following day when  
in the Royal Chapel at Holyrood " he would propone his mind to



them " .It was a troubled mind indeed but more troubled by the fate of his kingdoms than that of his mother whose life strings were held dangling in the hands of the crafty Master of Gray .

James told the Assembly that he had called them for two reasons : to contradict " certain evil reports blown and spread abroad of him by some of his own subjects , both within his realm and without , that he had made defection from the true religion " and also " for remitting of the ministers of the Kirk to a judgement concerning the discipline of the Kirk he purposed to establish that throughout his realm which by conference among them should be found most agreeable to the word of God " ( Calderwood p 199 ff ) .

David Lindsay , of Leith , was chosen moderator .Peter Young and Sir John Maitland of Thirlestane were the King's Commissioners . Both Lindsay and Thirlestane were men who knew the wisdom of a wise compromise .

In answer to a question " Whether the Bishops might have pre-eminence over the brethren , if not jurisdiction , yet ordinis causa ? " the Assembly replied " It could not stand with the Word of God ; only they must tolerate it , in case it be forced upon them by the civil power " . Also " The name of a Bishop is not to be taken ( as it hath been ) in papistry , but as in to all pastors and ministers " . It was subsequently admitted " some ministers might be entrusted with superior powers under the

control of the General Assembly , and subject to Presbyteries " .  
 The King insisted that the Bishops or those invested with  
 superintendence sanctioned by the Conference , should be amenable  
 to the General Assembly , and not to Presbyteries .The Assembly  
 assented to " the trial and censuring of such pastors as the  
 General Assembly shall give commission to visit , shall be in the  
 hand of the said Assembly , or such as they shall depute , until  
 further order be taken " .The Bishops , it is clear , were to  
 be Moderators within their bounds ( vide Lawson p 212 ) .

That this policy of accommodation might have had  
 support is evident from an act of the Synod of Merse and  
 Tweeddale : " For as much as there is risen a heavie and great  
 slander , not only through many parts of Scotland , but also among  
 divers reformed Kirks in other nations , that we of the  
 Ministry of Scotland are divided in opinion , touching the true  
 policy of government of the house of God , which is spread and  
 increased by subscribing of a letter , presented to the King's  
 Majesty by a number of us the Ministry , and by mistaking of the  
 simple and sincere meaning of the subscribers of the same ;  
 therefore we the whole brethren convened in this present  
 Synod , do manifest and publish to the whole world : that  
 among us there is no difference nor diversity of opinions  
 touching the Policy and Government of the house of God ; but we  
 do fully agree , that the same is the right government of

His House , agreeing with the blessed institution of His Son , the only Head of the same , which hath been exercised in Scotland by Ministers , Elders and Deacons , Particular Assemblies of Kirks , Presbyteries , Provincial and General Assemblies , as was before May 1584 years " ( Calderwood pp 213-5 ; Scott's Narration p 55 ) .

However , " The mixed government of bishops , or commissioners , and Presbyteries could not endure long ; howbeit those who had before been possessed in the benefice were tolerated still to enjoy the same " ( Scott's Narration p 55 ) . Complaints , as we have seen in the case of Adamson , were being continually made against the Titulars . It is interesting to observe the considerations involved in the presentation of Robert Pont to the Bishopric of Caithness : " he desired the judgement of the Brethren , if the living might not be enjoyed with a safe conscience , and without slander ; and that he was willing to be Minister at Dornoch , to take the charge of Visitation at the command of the Kirk and for his office and charge enjoy the living only " . The Assembly replied : " Let it please your Highness , we have received your letter , willing us to elect our brother Mr Robert Pont to the Bishopric Caithness vacant by the decease of Robert , Earl of March , your Highness's uncle . We praise God , that your Majesty hath a good opinion and estimation of such a person , as we judge the said Mr Robert to be ; whom

we acknowledge indeed to be alreadie Bishop according to the doctrine of Saint Paul , and qualified to use the function of a Pastor or Minister at the Kirk of Dornoch , or any other Kirk within your Higness' realm , where he shall be lawfully called , and worthie to have a competent living appointed to him in that regard ; as also to use the office of a Visitor or Commissioner within the bounds or Diocese of Caithness , if he be burdened therewith .But as to the corrupt estate or office of these , who have been called Bishops heretofore , we find it not agreeable to the Word of God " ( Calderwood p. 215 -6 ) .In this opinion we find sentiments typical of an age of formulation .Is it not suprising that Pont even took so serious a consideration of the matter as to consult the Assembly at all ? That he did so seems **to suggest that even now there were** those who might have **supported** a polity of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .Again , in its reply the Assembly seems to feel favourably disposed towards the office of Visitor whose functions were similar to that of the Titular episcopate .

In 1587 , the year of James ' majority there was brought into law an act dealing with the financial establishment of the Church ( Acta No 8 Acta Parl Scot 3-421 ) .This was intended to relate to the Titular Episcopate .The history of the act is obscure .Lawson asserts " the Presbyterian ministers were completely outwitted in a project devised by themselves against

the Titulars " . It seems that " this purpose was communicated to Secretary Maitland ----- and therefore they wished him to persuade the King that the feu mails of the temporal lands of the Prelacies should be annexed to the Minister's stipends .But he informed the King directly in the contrary , affirming that it was necessary that the temporal lands of the Prelacies should be annexed to the Crown , to enrich the same , which was then at small rent ----- the only profit and commodity that were obtained the Prelates got it , for whereas before they were called men of benefices , now they are called temporal lords , like to the rest of the common sort " ( Lawson op cit p 219 ; Historie of King James the Sext Bannatyne Club pp251-53 ) .Whatever be the verdict upon the motives actuating its promulgation the measure " put beyond all possibility the establishment of such a political episcopacy as prevailed in England " ( C.S. Terry A History of Scotland pp257&259 ) . The Church thus lost much of what had till then been recognised as belonging to it .But the Act made the restoration of a real prelacy difficult , and was therefore not so offensive to Presbyterians as it otherwise would have been .James and the Church were drawing nearer ( Lord Balfour op cit p 71 - ) .Whilst it is difficult to reconcile Dr Hewison's view of the matter : " This radical statute swept away the patrimony , and made the bishops paid officers of the

Crown " with the judgement of Prof Terry , it remains a fact that the Tulchanate was no more ( J.King Hewison The Covenanters Vol. I revised Edit . p 128 ) .The old **arrangement** essentially a mediaeval conception , was out-moded .In a real sense this Act marks the final establishment of the Reformation in Scotland . Here again there is the dichotomy of motive ; there were political advantages and financial gains involved but one great objection to the Titular Episcopate had been met. Henceforth the objections were to be severely doctrinal until the establishment of a full Presbyterian polity .Hume Brown comments : " That James should have consented to such an Act is decisive proof that his preference for bishops was due to mere reasons of State , and that he had no earnest conviction of their divine appointment for the guidance of the Church " ( Hume Brown op cit p 205 ) . This opinion,as we have seen needs some qualification . Thirlestane's association with the measure might possibly suggest that even at this late hour an effort was being made to effect a policy of accommodation .

Meanwhile international and national events were moving fast to shape church polity .

The execution of Mary at Fotheringay ,Papist though she might be , did not leave Scotland unaffected and did little to quieten the troubled church .Mortui non mordent was an ugly

expresssion even in that unsettled age . The Treaty of Berwick confirmed in July 1586 had been the initial move in the King's consolidation of his claim to be Elizabeth's successor ; the death of Mary , whilst not inevitable , was one of the few possible sequences .The "clear purpose " of James" was to be master in his own house , using his liberty to secure succession to the English crown , which it was said with little exaggeration , he was ready to take from the devil himself " ( Terry op cit p 249 ) . The reaction of Philip II was as inevitable as anything can be in this world of change .The Armada was more than a military expedition , however , it was the last gesture of the old faith in Western Europe and the execution at Fotheringay had given it time and place .The events of 1588 had also united King and Kirk in a common opposition . Flavit Deus et dissipati sunt was true of the proud galleons but the moaning of the winds of conspiracy did not die away .In 1591 there were sixteen " Papists and discontented Erles and Lordes " and only " eight Protestants and well affected to the course of England " ( Estimates of the Scottish Nobility during the Reign of James the Sixth pp62-3 ) .There were large areas in the North and South where adherents of the old faith

were still in the majority and what is most important , in places of strategic value .Emissaries of Rome were active ( D.Maclean The Counter Reformation in Scotland Chap. II ) .The document " Griefs of the Kirk " had been presented to the King on the 20 th of Feb. 1588 expressing the apprehension with which the Church authorities regarded the situation .But James , the ever shrewd , would take no drastic action even after Elizabeth had forwarded the letters carried by Pringle from Huntly and Errol to Phillip and Parma , which expressed dismay at the loss of the Armada and the readiness of many in Scotland to assist another attempt at invasion .In May 1590 James brought back to Scotland a Lutheran wife , Ann, second daughter of Frederick II of Denmark and Norway .During his absence from the country( it had been intended that he was to be away a short time but this was extended to six months ) , James made one of the most remarkable arrangements of his career ( vide Calderwood p 245 ) .Robert Bruce , one of the Edinburgh Ministers , who was to be later banished , was " willed to be acquaint with the affairs of the Country , and proceedings of the Council ; ( the king ) professing that he reposed more upon him , and the rest of the Ministry , than all his nobles .He was not disappointed for they did their endeavour ; and the country was never in greater peace ,than during his absence ; whereas before , few months or weeks passed



without slaughter and bloodshed " .It would seem indeed , that the Presbyterian party were becoming an influential power in the realm and one the King could reckon to his own advantage .Robert Bruce also officiated at the anointing of the queen in the Abbey Kirk of Holyrood though not without some qualms about the ceremony being " a superstitious rite " ( Hume Brown op cit p 210 ) .Andrew Melville's Latin Coronation Ode " the King acknowledged had honoured him and his country " ( Calderwood p 255 ) .The Kirk , on the other hand , was still apprehensive .At the General Assembly of Aug. 4 th 1590 James Melville , the Moderator , discoursed upon " the necessity of Discipline " because among other things " these Amaziahs , the belly -god Bishops in England , by moyen and money , were seeking conformity of our Kirk with theirs , as did Achaz and Uriah with the altar of Damascus " ( Calderwood p 286 ) . In February of this same year , John Norton , an English Stationer at Edinburgh , had been in trouble owing to his communications with Bancroft " whereof the Doctor craved information " .Of the twenty -three questions the first was : " Considering the King's edict 1584 how came it to pass , that the Bishops were so soon overthrown again , and then the Presbyteries so soon reestablished ; and the circumstances of that action ? " ( Calderwood p 246 ) .It is interesting to note

again Bancroft's recognition of the Titulars as bishops and his apparent anxiety to understand the position of the Scotch Church . Such consideration would suggest that there was still a desire , on the part of the Church of England , to make some pacific moves .

The years immediately succeeding the King's marriage were stormy and fractious .The feuds of Thirlastane and Bothwell , Moray and Huntly ; the continual threat of the Catholic reactionaries ; gave little peace of mind to Melville and his associates or indeed to any of those who wished to see the establishment of a moderate Protestant polity .Amongst these was Thirlestane himself : " and the history of his administration proves that he had the views and the capacity of a statesman. But he was acceptable to neither the extreme Protestants nor the extreme Catholics " ( Hume Brown op cit p 210 ) .It would , as we have seen , be a mistake to suppose that this policy of accommodation had no allies within the Church . The situation was certainly tense , and Thirlestane , acting on a policy of expediency urged the King to make his peace with the Kirk .At the Eighth Session of the Assembly held in Aug. 1590 " He willed the ministers to purge themselves , and to be impractical in their own cause . It was his duty , said he , to see them reformed , as well as it was their's to urge Him and the nobility to reform themselves .In no point was he so earnest as in this .In

the end , to please the Assembly , he praised God , that he was born in such a time , as in the time of the light of the Gospel ; to such a place , as to be King of such a Kirk , the sincerest Kirk of the world , The Kirk of Geneva , said he , kept Pasch and Yule , what have they for them ? They have no institution .as for our neighbour Kirk in England , their service is an evil said Mass in English , they want nothing of the Mass , but the liftings. I charge you , my good people , Ministers , Doctors , Elders , Nobles , Gentlemen and Barons , to stand to your purity , and to exhort the people to do the same , and I forsooth , so long as I brook my Life and Crown , shall maintain the same against all deadly etc. There was nothing heard for a quarter of an hour , but praising God and praying for the King " ( Calderwood p 286 ) . Even in this expedient panegyric it is to be noted that the King thought fit to remind the ministers of their responsibility . But it was of little use " The pulpit became insufferable to him . Every questionable theme from • downhill Davie Rizzio ( a hint at the King's reputed Father ) to the 'scumme about the Court ' was raked up by railing preachers ( Hewison op cit p 132 ) .

In 1590 the Assembly demanded that all ministers should subscribe to the Second Book of Discipline ( Book of the Universal Kirk vol. 2 p771 ) .Archbishop Adamson died on Feb. 19 th 1592 and Erskine had passed peacefully away on Mar 22 1590 thus leaving the less elevated moderation of Thirlestane to influence the King . The Assembly of May 21 st 1592 presented the request : " That the Acts of Parliament made in the Year of God 1584 against the Discipline of the Kirk , Libertie and Authoritie thereof , be annulled ; and the present Discipline , whereof the Kirk had had the practice , be ratified " ( Calderwood p 267 ) .By the Parliament of June 5 th 1592 the full Presbyterian polity was restored .By the Eighth Statute entitled " Act for the Abolishing of the Actis contrary to True Religion " ( Acta Parl Scot III 541-2 repeal 1612 c-1 4 -469 revival 1640 ) the Presbyterian Establishment and its courts were constitutionally recognised ( vide also Act 1706 c 6 ) . The years 1592 -96 were times of full Presbyterian settlement .Thirlestane , however , died in 1595 and without his moderating influence James and the Kirk drifted ever further apart .Pulpit vituperation reached its climax in the alleged slanders uttered by David Black , minister of St Andrews ( Melville Autobiog pp 323-25 ) . Black and Andrew Melville were cited to appear before

the King and Council .It was on this occasion that Andrew Melville reminded James in those famous words " there were twa kings in Scotland , twa kingdoms , and twa jurisdictions " ( vide H.J. Laski The Problem of Sovereignty pp 49-50 ; J.N. Figgis The Divine Right of Kings 2 nd edit pp 287 -8 ) . It was not in the temper of James to allow this sort of thing longer than was necessary to his purpose . Meanwhile the religious state of the country was such that the assembly of 1596 declared that " the most part of the parish kirks of Scotland are altogether destituted of all exercise of religion " ( Book of the Universal Kirk vol 3 pp803 , 878-9 ) .

We may note that the act of 1592 ratified and established the Presbyterian polity yet of itself did not state in specific terms that the Titular Episcopate was illegal .In fact they contrived to attend the Parliaments as representing the Spiritual estate .In the Edinburgh Parliament of April 3 rd 1584 we find the titulars of Aberdeen & Brechin , six lay abbots chosen among the Lords of the Articles .An Act passed in favour of the former expressly recognised him as " Bishop of Aberdeen " ( Acta Parl Scot vol. IV -pp 32f) .

In truth the country was drifting into a precarious state . The Presbyterian policy seemed to be one bent

on a course of constant criticism - a negative course indeed .The threat of a Roman reaction still loomed large , the financial state of the Church and Monarchy caused anxiety which might have been resolved had it not been for the rivalry of the " Octavians " and " Cubiculars " . The Falkland Convention of 1596 was called , without royal permission , to consider a protest at the possible recall of the Popish exiles .It was as its spokesman that Andrew Melville called James " bot God's sillie vassall " ( Melville Autobiog p 370 ) .

The King had now resolved on a course of action by which he hoped to restore some measure of order in Church government . He resolved " following the example of early Christian emperors , to convene an effective assembly , in order to clear up the vexed question of spiritual jurisdiction , the manner of applying doctrine , and the policie of the Church " ( Hewison op cit p144 ) . The Council was called to meet at Perth , where unhampered by the prejudices of " the Edinburgh Popes " he hoped a new accommodation could be at least initiated .To the council he put 55 questions , prepared apparently by the secretary Lindsay .The preamble stated " For as much as it is one of the Principal points of the office of a Christian King , to see God rightly honoured in his land , for effectuating whereof it is necessary , that the Spiritual Office -bearers in the Kirk

not only teach sound doctrine , concerning the points of salvation ; but also observe such a comely order in the Spiritual Policy ( agreeing with the Word of God , the laudable custom of the primitive Kirk , and with the Laws of the Country , and Nature of the People , for repressing the vices whereunto they are chiefly inclined ) as best may serve to establish and maintain the purity of Religion " ( Calderwood p 381 ) .

To the First Question " May not the matters of the external gubernation of the Kirk be disputed salva fide and Religione ? " .The answer given was " They may not " .

Reference was also made to " that uniformal conformitie is sought by our neighbours , enemies to the discipline , the Bishops of England " .The Sixth Question : " Is he a lawful pastor , who wanteth impositionem manum ? " elicited the remarkable answer " Imposition or laying on of hands , is not essential and necessary , but ceremonial and indifferent in admission of a Pastor " . Calderwood comments " In all these questions no hint of Bishops ; yet had the King set down a catalogue of such as he would prefer to that dignity , before Mr David Black was troubled " ( Calderwood p 381 ) .The extreme Presbyterian party opposed the legality of the Council but eventually James had the satisfaction

of obtaining the assurances that the King might in the General Assembly propose reform of any matter of external government and that no General Assemblies should meet without consent of the King . At the Dundee Assembly of 1597 of which the Moderator was Robert Pollock ( principal of the newly founded University of Edinburgh ) it was agreed to accept a new proposal by the King : nineteen commissioners were to be appointed who were to get access to the King for advice , to approach Parliament with schemes of reform , to plant and maintain ministers , to try cases where the Crown was aggrieved by Churchmen " ( Select Works of Rollock Wodrow Soc 1849 ; Christian Unity Papers p 55 ) . Calderwood says " for the Commissioners having access to the King when they pleased , and Commission to sit and consult with him , began soon to change their manners . They would rule all , both in and out of General Assemblies , as the King pleased . A fit wedge taken out of the Kirk to rent her with her own ; and the very needle which drew in the thread of episcopacy " ( Calderwood p409 , & pp 412 & 413 ) . Within a year the Commission had petitioned " in the name of the Kirk , for ministers to vote in Parliament . This was the only way ,



said corrupt and worldly ministers , to vindicate the Kirk from poverty and contempt , that some of the wisest of the ministry be chosen to sit in Council , Convention of Estates and Parliament , where they may reason and vote in their own causes and recover the Kirk rents " ( Calderwood ibid ) .The same assembly limited the place of Bishops only " to actual Preachers and Ministers " , This at least was a step towards the restoration of a purely spiritual episcopate ( James Cooper Reunion p 18 ) .James still protested " I mind not , said he , to bring in Papistical or Anglican Bishops ; but only to have the best and wisest of the Ministry , appointed by the General Assembly , to have place in Council and Parliament " ( Calderwood p 497 ) . The extremists answered through John Davidson " who desired the assembly not to be sudden , in concluding such weighty matters. See ye not , Brethren , said he how bonily beginneth to creep in , novus palliatus episcopus " .The Commissioners formed an " episcopate " whose powers were considerably strengthened by the strong support of James .Their function was similar to that of the Superintendents and Titulars .In 1598 we find controversy between the Commissioners and Robert Bruce whom they were examining over " the ceremonie of the imposition of hands ----- when they are laying the foundation of the Episcopate it was urged as necessary " ( Calderwood p 422 -3 ) .

The exposure of the Basilikon Doron " His Majesties Instructions to his Dearest Sonne , Henry , the Prince " caused a further hardening in the attitude of the extreme party and what wonder when he advised his son " to banish their conceited parities" ( King James ' Works , Winton's Edit . 1616 pp 194-209 ) . It was indeed the shrewd advice of an exasperated man who could , perhaps with some justification write that they were " verie pestas in the Church and Commonwealth of Scotland , whom , by long experience , I have found no desserts can oblish " .The Reformation "not proceeding from the Prince's order , as it did in our neighbour countrey of England , as likewise in Denmarke , and sundry parts of Germanie some fierie spirited men in the ministerie got such a guiding of the people at that tyme of confusion -----" ( Works ibid ) .

The Montrose Assembly of 1600 ratified the provisions that the Church's representatives might attend in Parliament if the King nominated them from a number selected by the Assembly .It was to be an annual election and they were to act on the instructions of the Assembly ( The Book of the Universal Kirk III-p949) . The vacant sees were filled by Lindsay , appointed to Ross ; Peter Blackburn to Aberdeen and George Gladstones to Caithness , Campbell of Brechin was the only Tulchan Titular still alive .He had retained his office of preacher at Brechin and also his seat in Parliament. In spite of Melville's great protest at the Montrose Assembly that held in Burntisland on May 15 th 1601 showed

support for the present policy ( Book of the Universal Kirk III p963 ) .

The last attempt made by James , as King of Scotland , to effect an accommodation was made at the Holyrood Assembly of 1602 .It was enacted :

1. Visitors should be appointed over sixteen districts or dioceses.
2. They were to examine pastors , presbyteries and laity .
- 3 . Private chaplains should be billeted on the nobles ( Book of the Universal Kirk III pp973-4).

The new office seems to have been , as one would naturally expect , of a more hierachical character than those envisaged in the Second Book of Discipline ( Acts of the Assembly vol 2 p501 ) .

The Assembly of April 24 th 1593 held at Dundee had not apposed the appointment of Visitors " For as much as the Visitors of Presbyteries , universally throughout the whole Realme , are thought a thing very necessary , and from diverse Assemblies Commission hath been given for that effect , a necessity yet remaining , which craveth the continuing of the said Commission , to visit , and try the Doctrine , Life , Conversation , Diligence and Fidelity of pastors , within the said Presbyteries " . It has been suggested that this was a complete revival of the old superintendency and " that in this fashion Episcopacy might

legally have come in " ( James Cooper Reunion p 17 ) .

The Visitors were directly responsible to the Assembly which , under pressure or otherwise , felt the need for a system of superintendency " It being considered by the Assembly , that for lack of a constant and uniform order of visitation of Synods , Presbyteries and Particular Kirks , the labours and travels , taken hitherto , have been almost unprofitable and ineffectual .Therefore that a solid order may be observed in Visitations in all times coming ..... ( Calderwood pp 461-2 ) .They were to examine First the state of the Congregation and Country : and last the state of the Presbytery in General " . So far the Titulars had no spiritual jurisdiction as did the Visitor but it was clearly the intention of the King to assimilate the two offices " Under colour of Visitation , the King and his led horse the Commission of the General Assembly , pressed to put two Bishops in possession of their Ecclesiastical jurisdiction .This was perceived and opposed unto .Yet by authority and cunning convoy , Mr George Gladstones his Commissioner for the Visitation of Caithness was renewed , and for the fashion an order setc down for visitation " ( Calderwood p 461 ) . Of the Visitors , George Gladstones was already Titular of Caithness and Robert Pont , Robert Howie , James Nicholson , James Melville , John Spottiswood , John Knox and Andrew Lamb were amongst those nominated to the prelacies . " Many are named here for the fashion who were never minded to accept the title of any Prelacy "

( Calderwood p 468 ) . That the nominations included these seems an indication that a genuine attempt was made to establish a constitutional episcopate as far this was at all possible under the circumstances .The attempted accommodation provided for the establishment of ecclesiastical representation in the Parliament , the reasonable supremacy of the Assembly , adequate supervision and the continuation of the local church courts .The opposition refused the gesture " Messrs Robert Bruce , Andrew Melville , John Davidson , men of great authority and credit in the Kirk , were with-holden from this Assemblie : and therefore no wonder matters went as they did " ( Calderwood p 469 ) . Dr James Cooper comments " So far all was constitutional .If there was still an opposition party in the Church the great majority alike of clergy and people were with the King " ( Cooper Reunion p 19 ) .

In view of the imminent accession of James to the English throne , the succession , as we have suggested , might have been restored to the Titular Episcopate in a way acceptable to the moderate element .It is one of the tragedies of Church History that this last attempt was to be the beginning of apparent success but ultimate failure . There were grave faults on both sides but as ever the voice of moderation failed to make itself heard .

On May 3 rd 1603 James arrived in London to be crowned King of England and Ireland . A new chapter was to begin

in the History of the Church in Scotland .

Before leaving Scotland , James re-iterated his policy of promoting a unified polity in the ecclesiastical affairs of both nations : " I must endeavour to establish Religion , and to take away corruption in both countries " ( Calderwood p 478 ) .Indeed a short time following the Hampton Court Conference the King went further : " He acknowledged the Church of Rome to be our Mother Church , although defiled with some corruptions , that he would be content for his own part , to meet those of the Roman Kirk in the mid-way , so that all novelties might be renounced on either side .And wished from his heart , it would please God to make him one of the instruments of such a general Christian Union in Religion , as , laying wilfulness aside on both hands , we might meet in the midst " . It would seem that an ecclesiastical unity was to James , an essential to a political unity but whether this would include a legislative incorporation is difficult to ascertain : " in all the speeches on this subject , and especially his own , there is a want of distinctness as to the object proposed " ( Hallam Constitutional Hist. Everyman Edit p 288 ) .The motives of the First Hampton Court Conference held on Jan. 14 th 1604 are therefore

necessarily difficult to distinguish. If James and his advisers felt it would establish limits for a uniform church polity there were facts which could well justify this hope. There still seemed no objection to episcopacy as such "As to episcopal government, or the lawfulness of prescribed forms, there was no difference of opinion" ( T. Lathbury *A History of the English Episcopacy* London 1836 p 70 ; H. S. Skeat *A History of the Free Churches of England* p 36 ) . Reynolds, as the theologian of the Puritan party pleaded for a more constitutional polity which although episcopal would have incorporated the features dear to those influenced by the continental reformers ( Neal *History of the Puritans* vol. I pp 410 - 14 , Mathieson *op cit* vol. I p 300 ) . These included clerical assemblies to meet every three weeks, "prophesyings" in rural deaneries and that appeals might lie from the archdeacon's visitation to the diocesan synod, composed of the bishop and his presbyters. This suggested accommodation might well have been the basis upon which the two national churches would have united. The fate of this hope rested in a real way upon the fate of these proposals. As Prof. Trevelyan has commented "It was a moment when a settlement might well have been made on a basis of comprehension, by a little widening of the

borders of a State Church designed to be elastic , more especially since toleration outside the Church was then regarded as permissible. To deny any legalised activity , either within or without the Establishment , to the movement which then had most influence on the laity and particularly on Parliament was to sow the seeds of civil war .Th at is precisely what James did at Hampton Court .When he exclaimed ' No Bishop , no King ' he was well within his rights , but the existence of the episcopate was not then at issue .When he added in a fury ' I shall make them conform themselves or I will harry them out of the land ' , he evoked a feud that would cost the blood and tears of three generations , and incidently transfer the sovereign power from King to Parliament " . Again " The refusal of James to grant toleration either inside or outside the Establishment was not the outcome of personal adherence to High Church religion such as inspired his son Charles. He was still a Calvinist in doctrine , but he feared the political associations of the democratic and earnest type of religion of which he had seen so much more than he liked in Scotland .' A Scottish Presbytery ' , he cried at Hampton Court , ' agreeth as well with a monarchy as God with the devil ----- Then Jack , Tom , Will and Dick shall meet



and at their pleasure censure me and my council " ( Vide G.M.Trevelyan " History of England p 384 ) .

That some concessions were made to the Puritan party is significant but the interaction between ecclesiastical and constitutional polity was so constant that there was no hope , to a man of the King's limitations , of further concessions in church order ( Liturgy and Worship pp186-7 - ) .The Hampton Court Conference had set the limits of a toleration upon which he hoped to effect his great scheme of a unified ecclesiastical policy .It is significant that Patrick Galloway , who was among those nominated to a Titular Bishopric in 1602, had held a watching brief at the Conference ( Calderwood p 468 ) . In his report of the proceedings sent to the Edinburgh Presbytery he makes the interesting statement that " The Bishops are admonished to judge no ministers , without the advice and assistance of some of the gravest Deans and Chaplains " ( Calderwood pp 475-76) .This report had the King's approval and it would suggest that even now he wished to see an episcopate not entirely prelatical in character .Mrs Jalland has recently observed that James " was firmly

convinced of the political value of uniformity , and so  
 of the need for episcopacy in England and Scotland alike;  
 though neither he nor the episcopal party in the Kirk  
 were apparently very clear in their minds exactly what  
 the theological significance of episcopacy was " ( The  
 Apostolic Ministry Edit K.Kirk Lond .1946 1st edit  
 p 418 ) . Such an assertion does not seem to take into  
 account the negations of the Second Book of Discipline .  
 It was just the theological i .e. the alleged unscrip-  
 tural basis of episcopacy that was assailed by the  
 Melvilles .It is natural to suppose that the episcopal  
 party had considered these negations quite apart from  
 political issues, which it is true loomed largely in  
 their minds .As the ties with the continental reformers  
 grew weaker is it too much to suppose that the accession  
 of James to the English throne influenced the Moderate  
 party towards a policy of accommodation ? The assert-  
 ions of James and the scruples of Spottiswoode ~~seem~~ again  
 to suggest that the theological basis of the episcopate  
 had been seriously considered .Typical among the moder-  
 ates were David Lindsay , who at the age of seventy , had

been nominated titular of Ross in 1600 ; Peter Rollock ,  
 titular of Dunkeld and Peter Blackburn , who succeeded  
 Cunningham in the see of Aberdeen in 1603 ( Spottiswoode's  
 Hist 1676 edit pp513-4 ; Lawson op cit p 265 ) . Black-  
 burn and Lindsay accompanied James to London in 1603  
 and it may well have been that the implications of the  
 1610 accommodation was then the subject of some  
 discussion and in the seven years following . That the  
 1610 consecrations were not made at the instigation of  
 political impulse could possibly be inferred from the  
 conditions prevailing in England . The Convocation of  
 1603 produced the " unconfirmed " canons which were not  
 ratified by Act of Parliament and therefore only binding  
 on the clergy ( vide Preface Burn's Ecclesiastical Law ) .  
 They were a temporary expedient to establish an ecclesiastical  
 norm . On Bancroft's translation to Canterbury an  
 attempt was made to enforce the subscription of the  
 clergy . The result is illuminating . Neal estimated three  
 hundred clergy were silenced or deprived ; Collier  
 estimates forty-nine ( Neal op cit vol. II p 45 ; John  
 Forbes Records Wodrow Soc. p125 ; Jeremiah Collier  
 Eccl. Hist . Vol. I 1708 & Vol. II 1714 This divine  
 a non-juror , had an interesting career . He was  
 " consecrated " suffragan Bishop of Thetford and so one  
 of the

uncanonical bishops of the Church of England ) .Neal  
 estimates the actual number of Puritan clergy as 1500  
 and that " The bishops were obliged to relax the rigour  
 of the canons for a time , and to accept promises of  
 partial conformity " ( Neal op cit vol. 2 p45 ) . Further  
 " the great mass of the puritans still deemed separation  
 unlawful " ( ibid p 51 ) .In 1605 the puritan ministers  
 of Lincolnshire ( the Brethren of the Second Separation )  
 published " An Abridgement " of the points of difference  
 between themselves and the strict episcopalians .It is  
 interesting to find that as late as 1812 the trustees  
 of St Leonards Church ,Kirkstead ,Lincolnshire tried  
 to secure by an action of ejectment at Lincoln Assizes ,  
 the setting aside of the presentation by the Lord of the  
 Manor in 1794 , of a Church of England clergyman .The  
 trustees lost the actual church building but won the  
 endowments with which they built a Presbyterian  
 Chapel ( History of Lincolnshire by William White  
 1842 p 444 ) . Evidently the spirit of The Abridg-  
 ment was long in dying ! It should be noted that  
 the Brethren of the Second Separation were not  
 presbyterians and of course most certainly not  
 High Church episcopalians ( Lathbury op cit p 74 ) .  
 They were it would seem of a similar mind to the

Scottish Moderates represented by such men as Blackburn, Titular of Aberdeen : " Mr Peter Blackburn was a man of good parts , but whilst he studied to please the opposers of the episcopal state , he made himself ungracious to both " ( Keith Scottish Bishops 1824 edit p 131 ) . No doubt the efforts to effect an accommodation in Scotland would find much sympathy among many of the clergy characterised by the opinions of those included in the Second Separation .

The first Scotch Parliament to be held after James' accession to the English throne was held on April 10 th 1604 . It was prorogued until July 3 rd and on the 10 th a Commission was issued to examine the first steps for the realisation of the King's great dream : the union of the two kingdoms . The Archbishop of Glasgow , the Bishops of Ross and Caithness were on this commission . The scheme was finally defeated by the suspicions of the English commercial interests and by the independent spirit of the Scotch ( Hume Brown op cit p247 ) The setting up of the Commission was followed by an " Act in Favour of the Kirk " . This ratified all former acts in favour of the Kirk and " religion presently professed and established within this realme of Scotland " ; confirmed acts against

all " Jesuits , papists , seminary priests and their resettlers , prohibited the Commissioners for the Union from deliberating anything prejudicial to the religion presently professed in Scotland and the discipline established and observed " ( Acta Parl Scot Vol. 4 p 264; Cook in his History vol. 2 p 156 says that this is not among the printed acts .This seems to be a confusion of Calderwood's similar statement in his History p 482. Maybe this refers to Morton's Act ) The scheme for Union was viewed with some apprehension by the Presbyterian party .True they had every justification for this state of mind if they wished to retain the settlement of 1592 .Although this was still legal we have seen how the Kirk was moving towards a full system of superintendence . It was their fear that a Union would hasten this process finally leaving Scotland with a rigid hierarchy.Challenging regal and secular powers to interfere , the Assembly met at Aberdeen on July 2 nd 1605 . The Assembly had been previously "stayed " by Sir Alexander Straiton , the Royal Commissioner and Patrick Galloway , the Moderator of the last Assembly .Nineteen ministers elected by only

nine out of fifteen presbyteries attended ( Lawson op cit p 270 ) .John Forbes was elected Moderator and the right of assembly asserted ( Forbes' Records p 134 ) ." The result was that all the members of the Assembly were summoned before the Council .Thirteen confessed their fault and were pardoned but six , including Forbes and Welsh ,Knox's son in law were imprisoned ; " The ministers embraced one another and thanked God for his presence in the whole action ..... upon the morn they were conveyed to Blacknesse .Messrs Andrew Melville , James Melville , John Carmichael and other ministers accompanied them , where they parted with thanksgiving , prayers and many tears , more confirmed in the cause. The King and the Commissioners of the General Assembly thought it now fit time , when the ministers imprisoned in Blacknesse were convicted of treason , to try the patience and constancie of the rest of the ministry " ( Forbes ' Records pp 155-7 ) .It was accordingly resolved that a questionnaire be sent out to the Synods who were to meet as " all upon one day .So one Synod could not understand the resolution of another ".

The Five Articles were :

1. That in the next ensuing General Assembly ,  
no former acts made in any preceeding assembly  
( his Majesty being present ) , be in any  
way touched , altered or interpreted .
2. That the estate of Bishops be not meddled  
with , but continued in the same condition  
they are presently in , till His Majestie's  
further pleasure and will be known.
3. That there be no alteration of any of the  
Commissioners , except upon the trial of some  
notable fault in their doctrine , life and  
conversation .
4. That notwithstanding of any appellation , the  
Commissioners shall proceed : they always  
for their proceeding being answerable to the  
next General Assembly .
5. That they acknowledge the warrant of their  
meetings to come by permission of the Prince .

The articles were rejected by " the Synod of Merse and  
Teviotdale " and "others did the like , or referred to  
the General Assembly " ( Forbes Apologetical Narration  
p 156 ) .The Commissioners were the unpopular instruments



of the royal policy : they were " first of a perpetuall dictatura , under the title of Commissioners , as the thinnest cover of their intentions , and next of antichristian slavery of the Hierarchy " ( ibid p 157 ) .

On July 9 th 1606 a Parliament was summoned at Perth when ten bishops represented the spiritual estate, The King's supremacy was asserted with renewed vigour ; the temporalities were restored to the spiritual estate as before the Act of Annexation i.e. the Leith Agreement ; there was to be no further dilapidation of the Bishoprics ( Calderwood p 532 ) . The Oath of Supremacy exhibits the real fear of a Roman reaction. " I do utterly renounce , and forsake all foreign jurisdiction " ( ibid ) . We must not forget that this was a motive in the King's attempt to effect , as soon as possible , some sort of accommodation. ( James Cooper Plea for Reunion p 22 ; D. Maclean The Counter Reformation in Scotland chapter III ) . The answer of the extreme Presbyterian party was plain : " If ye should ( God forbid ) authorise the authority of Bishops , and their pre-eminence above their Brethren , ye should bring into the Kirk of God the Ordinance of man , and that thing which the experience of preceeding ages hath testified to be the ground of great idleness , palpable ignorance , unsufferable pride , pitiless tyranny , and shameless

ambition in the Kirk of God " ( Calderwood p 528 & 521 ; Cunningham Church History of Scotland p 464 ) . Much has been made of the pomp with which " The first day of the Parliament ten bishops rode , two and two , betwixt the Earles and Lords " but may it not have been that the Titulars , besides more personal considerations were also mindful of the need for preserving their estate ? Even Calderwood asserts : " This made the noblemen to take up their presuming honours ; and to mistake them , as soon as they had set them up " ( ibid ) . It is most important to observe that the Red Parliament made no definition of the spiritual functions of the episcopate ( Cooper Plea for Reunion p 20 ) . The royal commissioner of this Parliament , George Horne , first Earl of Dunbar , one of the most distinguished of the Wedderburns , was on the whole a sincere exponent of the King's ecclesiastical policy . His wife's mother was Mary , daughter of Cardinal David Beaton of St Andrews so that things ecclesiastical were in a real sense in the blood ( New Statistical Account of Scotland -Haddingtonshire p 75 ) . The Parliament was the scene of a spirited protest by Andrew Melville

" after he had gotten enterie into the Parliament house , not without great difficultie , stood up to speak and protest .But how soop he was espied , one wast sent to him to command him to depart ; which notwithstanding he did not , till he had made his mind known " ( Calderwood p 531 , 519 , 537 ) .

On May 21 st 1606 James had written from Greenwich that Andrew and James Melville , James Balfour , William Scott , John Carmichael , Robert Wallace , Adam Coult and William Watson should meet him in London " to treat with you , in matters concerning the peace of our Church of Scotland " .They were unwilling to go .The Earl of Dunbar told them " they must go , or do worse " .(Calderwood ibid ) . On the other hand there is evidence the best was intended ( Forbes Records p 165 ) .

The Second Hampton Court Conference met on Sept 20 th 1606 .The Episcopal party was represented by Gladstones of St Andrews , Spottiswoode of Glasgow , Law of Orkney , two ministers Robert Howie and Patrick Sharp ; the Earls of Dunbar and Orkney , Lord Fleming , the Laird of Lauriston , the King's Advocate , Sir Thomas Hamilton ( Calderwood p 537 ) .It was entirely a Scottish Confer-

ence : " none were suffered to stay within" except the persons directly concerned .It cannot be stressed too strongly that the parallel with the First Hampton Court Conference is of importance.

Calderwood admits that " they were courteously received by the Bishop of Canterbury " but as in the case of the former conference no compromise was possible .The sad and bitter tale of Andrew Melville 's four years imprisonment in the Tower and final banishment has often been told .Coercive measures were continued in Scotland " This time was chosen to strike a terror in the hearts of the ministers , that were to convene at Linlithgow, in the month following " ( Calderwood p 549) .

To effect a settlement the Convention at Linlithgow was held on Dec. 10 th 1606 " to advise and resolve upon the remedies of the bypast distractions , preventing of imminent dangers by the daily increase of Papists , travelling in all corners of that kingdom , to disturb the peace of the Kirk and Country , and to subvert our Royal Estate , and for settling a good order and quietness in the Kirk and obedience to our authority " ( Calderwood p550 ) .This is an admirable summary of James ' policy mixture though it be of the secular and spiritual .

Thirty secular lords were present and one hundred and thirty ministers .Calderwood states that " out of some (presbyteries ) five or six , as they were thought meet to favour the purpose ; whereas by the Act made in the Assembly holden at Dundee , no more than three ought to be admitted out of the Presbytery " ( Calderwood p 552 and James Melville Diary Wodrow Soc. p 683 ) . Law , titular Bishop of Orkney preached the opening sermon taking as his text the words " Pray for the peace of Jerusalem" . James Nicholson ,titular of Dunkeld , was nominated Moderator .Some of the ministers " answering they had no commission from their Presbyteries to vote in any thing voted as private men " ( Calderwood ibid ) .The memory of the Gunpowder Plot of Nov. 5 th 1605 was still vivid when the Assembly met and it was enacted that every presbytery should have an agent to inform the Privy Council of the presence of Papists .He was to have a hundred pounds yearly paid by the Treasurer which was meant to cover his expenses but " if he be a Bishop , that he bear the burden himself " ( Calderwood p 553 ) . The Moderator then initiated a debate on " what was the cause of the jars in the Kirk ? " .Among the reasons submitted was " a fear possessing all honest men 's hearts that Bishops were brought in ,to spoil us of our Discipline .The Bishops protested , that there was no

such thing in their minds , and that they would submit themselves , in all time coming , to the judgement of the General Assembly , and his Majesty was never of another mind " .Then his Majesty's desire was proposed , that till Papists were repressed and jars removed out of the Kirk , a constant moderator might be admitted in every Presbytery ; because in the changing of the Moderators , the diligence in exacting of the process failed ; because it was alleged , the new Moderator was not acquainted with the former proceedings .It was answered in the privie conference that every Brother of the Presbytery should be acquaint with the affairs of the Presbytery, much more the fittest chosen for the purpose " (Calderwood p554ff ) .Patrick Galloway Moderator of the former "legal" assembly proposed three arguments :

1. The prejudicing of the Presbyteries , that understood best the qualification of their members in their free election .
2. The fear of their usurpation over their brethren.
- 3 . The prejudice of the General Assembly , seeing by appearence there is no other thing meant , but to make the Assembly consist of Bishops , and Moderators of Presbyteries " .

It was answered :

1. The Moderator shall be answerable to the Synod

for all his oversights and offences , and removable by them after lawful trial , that another may be preferred to his place .

2. Every presbytery shall have the free election of two or three Commissioners , to be sent to every Assembly . It shall be in their option to choose the Moderator .

Finally it was agreed " that he , who before was named agent , should be this constant moderator " .The proposals were carried by all seculars and 125 of the ministers ( Calderwood p 558 ) .

The proposals of the accommodation may be summed up thus :

1. One minister of acknowledged ability should be chosen to preside as constant moderator in each presbytery , and this office should appertain to the Bishops in those Presbyteries within the bounds of which they resided .

2. The same was to be arranged in the case of the provincial Synods .

3. If in a Provincial Assembly there is " Bishop making residence actually and lawfully , and having the Moderation of one of the Presbyteries , the Moderators of the Presbyteries within the said bounds being proposed in leete , the meet of them shall be choosen by the said assembly to be Moderator , his Majesty's Commissioners ' consent there present being had thereto"

How did the accommodation of Linlithgow fare ? " The Presbyteries were urged to accept their constant Moderators , under pain of Rebellion , and putting of them to the horne ; and in like manner the person nominated . Many Presbyteries through fear yielded : some of the Moderators themselves refused to accept " ( Calderwood p562 ) .

In the synods : " There was not a Synod in Scotland , that had accepted as yet the Provincial Moderator , except Angus and that not without opposition " ( Calderwood pp567-74 ) . The meetings of the Synods were certainly marred with scenes of disorder frequently interrupting discussions ( Melville's Diary Wodrow Soc. p 703 ) .

At Perth " The Comptroller , in great rage chapping on his breast , said with a loud voice , the Devil a Jesus is here . When Mr Howie was proceeding in prayer , he throwed the table with the green cloth over upon him " ( Calderwood p 567-4 ; Melville's Diary p703 ) .

The following observations may well be made upon the Linlithgow Accommodation :

1. It was an attempt to define the spiritual function of the Titulars .
2. The King urgently wanted a peaceful settlement and there was a genuine desire among the clergy for a prudent accommodation ( Book of the Universal Kirk III- pp1060-3 ) .
- 3 . The Titular Bishops seemed anxious to effect a Presbyterian-Episcopal Accommodation : " the king was little content because they proceeded.... not freelier



" .Lord Holyroodhouse blamed the Bishops for having by some mistake made a voluntary submission " of new to the Presbyteries " ( Melville's Diary pp687-8 ) .

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Linlithgow Accommodation was entirely unsuccessful or indeed unpopular . Cook observes : " Whilst the conduct of the Synods and the sentiments expressed by many of the ministers , showed that the ecclesiastical innovations were contrary to the wishes and feelings of the people , the Bishops possessed many advantages for influencing the public mind ; and it soon became apparent that numbers were inclined to relax their opposition, and even support what they had personally condemned .Although the Prelates had been furnished by the King with the means of crushing , by the intervention of the civil authority ,all who resisted their pretensions , they seem , except in a single instance , to have avoided the use of this hazardous expedient , resting their hopes of success upon the application of motives , the force of which , when acting on a great body of men , they readily appreciated " ( Cook History of The Church of Scotland vide Lawson op cit p 286 ) .In fact it has been suggested that the Bishops held the purse strings " and when interest or inclination guides the mind , the understanding not unfrequently becomes subservient

and exhibits in a favourable light , what under other circumstances , would have rejected and condemned " (Calderwood p 578 ) .

It is clear , however , that the Bishops Visitations of 1608 give practical evidence of the unifying value of the episcopate : " By policie on the one side , and terror on the other , they got too much advantage among the weak and simple of the ministry , in the choice of men in some Presbyteries " ( Calderwood p 578 ) . It is a fact of history that in a short space of time a remarkable unanimity is seen to be spreading over the distracted church. Cook states : " The Prelates wisely availed themselves of what all considered as so formidable , to inculcate harmony and moderation ; they represented the importance of summoning a General Assembly to devise the most effectual means of resisting Popery ; and they recommended that , previous to its meeting , a conference should be held with the view of forming an agreement respecting the discipline and order of the Church " ( vide Lawson op cit p 296 ) .

A meeting of all parties was held at Falkland on June 15 th 1608 and the result of the deliberations issued in stricter measures against the Papists ( James VI Parl XX ch 6 ) .

The Bishops and " so many other Commissioners of

of the General Assembly , as were upon their course met in the Chapel of Falkland Palace ; the ministers met in the Parish Church, Patrick Simpson , Minister of Stirling being Moderator " ( Calderwood p 584 ) . This arrangement resembled an Upper and Lower House of Convocation . The Convention was an unofficial affair and it would seem likely that opinions would be reasonably free. Perhaps we could go so far as to suggest that it was an effort to effect an accommodation untrammelled by the restriction of party or suspicion of the State . In true Convocation fashion , the "Lower " House of Ministers sent up their submission by the hand of their moderator . These included three depositions of importance :

1. That the cautions of the General Assembly be insert in the body of the Act of Parliament , made in favour of the Bishops ; and that they be censured accordingly , as was craved by the Commissioners of the General Assembly , at the Parliament holden at Perth , where the said act was made .

2. That the Discipline and Government of the Kirk , Practised , Established , Sworn and Subscribed unto stand inviolable..

3. That Assemblies General and Provincial be restored to their own integrity , as more effectual means to beat down the enemies .

4 . That the banished and confined Brethren God's faithful servants , be restored to their own places and liberties .

These submissions were accepted by the " Upper House " who urged that " the next Assembly might be kept peaceably with the King's leisure and goodliking , which could not be obtained , unless the Articles following were yielded unto " . These articles included : " That the questions, presently standing in controversy among the Ministers , anent the matters of Government , be untouched and unhandled on either side , till the next General Assembly , and no occasion be given by private or public speeches , of any further distraction of minds " ( Calderwood p588 ) .

The extreme Presbyterian party according to the Commission of Fife's Instructions " had offered to debate the matter of church government with our Brethren , intending Episcopal Government " and to defend the Discipline " to impugn what can be opposed against the same , or what can be said for Episcopal Government " ( Calderwood p 589 ) . It seems that " Mr James Melville disliked the challenge ; because it imported the calling of the Discipline and Government in

question namely now when their party was to be judge " ( Calderwood ibid ) .That there was a genuine desire for accommodation is an assumption supported by the visit of Abbot and Higgins as representatives of the Church of England " The English Doctor seemed to have no other direction , but to persuade the Scots , that there was no substantial difference in religion betwixt the two Realmes , but only in things indifferent concerning Government and Ceremonies ; and to report that it was his Majesty's will , that England should stand as he found it , and Scotland as he left it . But when he came to St Andrews , Mr Robert Howie , a man of seditious and turbulent spirit, declaimed against the Discipline and Government of our Kirk ; and then they uttered their mind in plain terms ; no order was taken with so manifest a breach after the last Conference . This was the policy of the aspiring bishops , to cry peace , peace , and to crave silence of their opposits , when in the mean time they minded not to be silent themselves , when they found occasion " ( Calderwood p 589 ) .

The General Assembly held at Linlithgow in July 1608 is distinguished by the further advance of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation. James Law , Titular of Orkney , was chosen Moderator " by a plurality of votes " . Measures against the Papists were continued and for the

first time " we have the name of Archbishop , which was never heard of before in the Assembly attributed to any minister " The Bishop was referred to as " the Bishop of every Synod " Efforts were made to establish episcopal oversight : " The Moderators pressed to have Bishops appointed Visitors of their own Diocese ; but it was resisted and therefore all visitation was left off , as if no visitation could be had without them " ( Calderwood pp595-99) .

The chief results of the Assembly were :

- 1 The Bishops were continued Commissioners of the Assembly .
2. The Bishops were established Moderators of the Presbyteries where they were instituted .
3. A certain measure of oversight was granted to them .
4. Another Conference relating to Church polity was proposed.

However , " For how can an Assembly be counted free and full, where the chief ensign -bearers are excluded " so comments Calderwood as representing the extreme Presbyterian party ( Calderwood pp600-601 ) .

The Edinburgh Convention of Nov. 15 th which seems to have set again in the following December and January further

regulated the powers of the episcopate :

1. " That they should be examiners of pedagogues , that went with Noblemen and Gentlemen's sons out of the country .

2. That no young gentleman suspected of Popery be entered to their Lands , till they have the Bishops recommendation to the inquest , and a certificate of their soundness in religion " ( Calderwood ibid ) .

Another conference was held at Falkland on May 4 th 1609 between four of the Privy Council , the Episcopal Party and the Presbyterian Party : " For the Bishops were named St Andrews Glasgow , Messrs Patrick Sharpe , Robert Howie and Phillip for the Ministers , Messrs Patrick Galloway , John Carmichael , William Scot and William Cooper " .The points considered were :

1. Whether there should be a constant moderator in each Synod and Presbytery .

2. Whether the limitations or "cautions " of episcopal authority should be observed .  
( Calderwood pp606-13; Lawson op cit p303 ; Scott Narration p213 )

After discussion it was resolved to defer decision and to hold another conference at Stirling. This in turn was deferred. The meeting of the Parliament so soon after the Falkland Conference probably made this unnecessary . James Melville comments : " the Bishops gained thus much , that no opposit-

ion was made against them in Parliament " ( Diary Melville pp780 ,782-4 ) .Those ministers desiring an accommodation are designated " so many Balaams ,Judases , Esaus , and Shemeis " ( ibid ) .

The Parliament met at Edinburgh on June 17 th 1609 . After Acts against the Roman Catholics there followed " an Act of the Commissariats " allowing the episcopate the civil jurisdiction which their predecessors possessed before the Reformation in cases of divorce , and in all cases spiritual and ecclesiastical within their several Dioceses . They were also permitted to appoint commissioners and deputies .Scott comments : " so that which should have been granted to Presbyteries was concredited to Bishops " (Scott Narration p 213 ff ) .Inspite of Hume Brown's judgement that this was "susceptible of the most dangerous abuse " the act limited the restoration of episcopal jurisdiction " in case the said commissioners ,to be appointed by the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow as said is ,perform not their duty, the Lords of Session shall determine in the same and shall judge upon all decreets and sentences alleged to be wrongfully pronounced by them " ( Hume Brown History hp cit p249 ; Lawson op cit p 304 ) .The parliament also enacted " regulations of vestments for all officials , not merely churchmen only " ( Acta Parl Scot. IV 372 ,430-6 ) .



The Spiritual Estate was further " strengthened " by the Establishment on Feb.15 th 1610 of two Courts of High Commission ( Book of the Universal Kirk 3- 1078 ) .There were to be two ,one in each archbishopric but these were subsequently merged into one under the presidency of the Primate .Each court was composed of the archbishop , and other bishops and a number of laymen .A quorum consisted of the archbishop , and four lay or clerical members.There were to be no appeals ( vide Proclamation Mar 1610 ) . It was essentially a regal measure but its adoption was later to dash the hopes of a Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation .

The appointment of Archbishop Spottiswoode on Jan 30 th 1610 as an Extraordinary Lord of Session in place of the Earl of Lothian had also further established the episcopal estate .This was a reversion to the pre-Reformation practice and in point of fact the office was a supernumerary one without emoluments ( Hist Account Senators College of Justice Edin 8 vo 1832p48 ) .

The time was now ripe for the definition of polity in the church .The king's letter instructed the Primate : " And therefore we will , and require you to make choice of the most wise , discreet and peaceably disposed ministers among you "

( Calderwood p 612 ; Book of the Universal Kirk 3-1083 ) . Scott states " Money was given largely to such as served the King and the Bishops , under pretence of bearing their charges " ( Apologetical

narration p 224 ) . Such were the suspicions which formed a background for the ensuing assembly .

The Assembly met in Glasgow on June 8 th 1610 .The Earl of Dunbar represented the sovereign and the Church of England by Hampton , Myreton and Hudson ,The constituents of the assembly were fourteen nobles ,thirteen barons , seven commissioners of burghs and one hundred and thirty - three ministers ( Book of the Universal Kirk III-1085 ) . The proceedings opened : " A Fast was kept " and Spottiswoode preaching at the morning service held in St Mungo's Cathedral said " Religion must not be maintained ,after the manner it was brought in , in this land .It was brought in by Confusion : but it must be maintained by Order .It was brought in against authority : it must be maintained by Authority " ( Calderwood p623 ) . James Law , Bishop of Orkney , preaching later "took upon him to prove the lawfulness of Episcopal government .He insisted most upon Antiquity, Universality , and Perpetuity : but he passed by jus divinum ,jus facti , and how far the power of his Bishops should be extended " ( Calderwood ibid ) . Law's defence of episcopacy is of interest as he was defending the Titular Episcopate and the fact that Hudson , the Church of England representative ,preached on the same theme in the afternoon is most suggestive : " After noon the little Chaplain Doctor Hudson taught upon Acts 2 for proof of the superiority of Bishops , he alleged Christ's teaching his Apostle , some at his head , some at his bosom , some at his feet " (Calder-

wood p 624 ; Lawson op cit p 308 ) . Spottiswoode was chosen Moderator " all but five voting for him " . The proposals for " the means of peace and concord " were discussed in committee . The other candidates for the Chair were not Titulars : Patrick Sharp , Patrick Lindsay and John Mitchelson .

The New Discipline was announced on the afternoon of June 9 th and approved by all with two exceptions ( Book of the Universall Kirk 1086-98 ) . It consisted of ten " Heads and Articles " :

I. It is declared , that the alleged Assembly held at Aberdeen , is null in itself , especially in respect it had not his Majesty's allowance and was discharged by His Highness' Commissioner. And because the necessity of the Kirk craveth , that for order taking with the Common enemy and other affairs of the Kirk , there be yearly General assemblies , the indication whereof the Assembly acknowledgeth to appertain to His Majesty by the prerogative of his Royal Crown , the General assembly was to request his Majesty that General Assemblies may be holden once in the year or at least , in respect of the necessity foresaid , that his Majesty would appoint a certain time , at which the same shall be holden precisely in all

time coming .

2. It is thought expedient , that the Bishops shall be moderators in every diocesan synod , and the synod shall hold twice every year of the Kirks of every Diocese , viz in April and October; and where the Dioceses are large , that there be two or three Synods in convenient places for the ease of the ministry .

3. That no sentence of Excommunication , or Absolution , be pronounced against , or in favours of any person , without the knowledge and approbation of the Bishop of the Diocese , who must be answerable to his Majesty for all formal and impartial proceeding therein ; and the process being found formal , the sentence to be pronounced at the discretion of the Bishop , by the Minister of the parish , where the offender dwelleth , and the process began , and in case the Bishop shall be found to have stayed the pronouncing of the sentence against any person , that hath merited the same , and against whom the process

hath been lawfullit deduced , the same being tried , and he convicted in the General Assembly thereof , that advertisement shall be made to his Majesty to the effect another may be placed in his room .

4. That all representations be directed hereafter to the Bishop , and upon any presentation given or otherwise suit made to any to be admitted to the ministry , the Bishop is to require the Ministers of these bounds where he is to serve , to certify by their testificate unto him of the party suitor his past conversation and ability and qualification for that function , and upon return of their certificate , the Bishop is to take further trial ; and finding him qualified , and being assisted by such of the Ministry of the bounds where he is to serve , as he will assume unto himself , he is then to perfect the whole Act of Ordination .

5 In Deposition of Ministers , the Bishop associating to himself that the whole of the Ministers of these bounds where the delinquent served , he is then to make trial of his fault , and upon just cause found , to deprive him .

6 . That every minister on his admission shall

swear obedience to his Majesty and his Ordinary according to the form set down in the Conference ( in the year of God 1571 ) whereof the tenor follows : I , A.B. , now nominated and admitted to the Church of D. utterly testify ..... that James VI , by the grace of God , King of Scots , is the only supreme governor of this Realm , as well in things temporal as in the conservation and defence of Religion , and that no foreign prince , prelate , state or potentate has or ought to have any jurisdiction , power , superiority , preeminence or authority within this Realm .And therefore I renounce all foreign jurisdiction..... and shall bear faithful and true allegiance to His Highness , his heirs and legal successors .... and further I acknowledge ... to hold the said possessions of the same under God only of his Majesty and Crown royal of this Realm .

7 . The visitation of each Diocese is to be done by the Bishop himself ; and if the bounds shall be greater than he can overtake , he is then to make special choice and to appoint some worthy man

to be visitor in his place . And whatsoever minister , without just cause and lawful excuse made, shall absent himself from the visitation of the Diocesan Assembly , he shall be suspended from his office and benefice , and if he amend not he shall be deprived .

8. Exercise of doctrine is to be continued weekly among the ministers at the times of their accustomed meetings , and to be moderated by the Bishop if he be present , or else by any other whom he shall appoint at the time of the Synod .

9 .The Bishops shall be subject in all things concerning their life , conversation, office and benefice , to the censures of the General Assembly , and being found culpable shall, with his Majesty's advice and consent , be deprived .

10 That no Bishop be elected but who has passed the age of forty years complete, and who has been an actual teaching minister for at least ten years . ( Calderwood p631- 2 ) .

Thus the accommodation envisaged an Episcopate subject to the General Assembly of Bishops , Presbyters and Laymen

whose enactments were subject to royal consent .The following features of the old Presbyterian polity were preserved :

1. A General Assembly was to be summoned yearly.
2. The Synod of every province ( again as from 1560-72 called the Diocese ) shall meet twice a year , as previously ( Cooper Plea p 35 ) .
- 3 .The " Ministry of the Bounds " continues its functions : of examining candidates for the ministry , Judicial , Meeting for mutual edification and theological discussion . ( Calderwood p637 ) .
- 4 The Right of election to a charge seems to combine in an ideal way the freedom of the Presbyterian polity with the safeguard of episcopal approbation . Such an arrangement might have prevented the troubles of 1843 .

The results of the " Anglic Assembly " were received with remarkable unanimity : " What opposition was made in other Synods I have not inquired ; but this , in general , I know , that however there was great murmuring , there was weak resisting ; ministers were become so faint hearted , and careless of the liberties of Christ's kingdome " ( Apologetical Narration p 234 ) . There were disorders in the Diocesan Synod of Fife held on Oct 9 th and in the Synod of Lothian ( Scott - Extracts from



Kirk Session Records of Perth Advocate's Lib. Edin mss & Calderwood p 642 ) . That such a change should have been effected at all is not only a testimony to royal supremacy but also to what must have been a genuine desire for peace on behalf of a large number within the church's ministry .

In the middle of September Archbishop Spottiswoode of Glasgow , Bishop Andrew Lamb of Brechin and Bishop Gavin Hamilton of Galloway went to London by royal command ( Hewison op cit p 188 gives Andrew Cant not Lamb ) . " At their first audience " says the Archbishop , " the King declared what the business was for which he had called them , speaking to this purpose - That he had to his great charge received the Bishoprics forth of the hands of those that possessed them , and bestowed the same upon such as he hoped should prove worthy of their places ; but since he could not make them Bishops , not could they assume that honour to themselves, and that in Scotland there was not a sufficient number to enter charge by consecration , he had called them to England , that being consecrated themselves , they might at their return give ordination to those at home , and so the adversaries 'mouths be stopped ' , who said that he did take upon him to create Bishops, and bestow spiritual offices , which he never did , nor would presume to do acknowledging that authority to belong to Christ alone,

and those he had authorised with his power " ( Lawson op cit . p 315 ) .There seems no point in doubting the king's intentions ; he wanted a unified church polity acceptable to both churches and one with " a spiritual " if not a " theological " basis .If we may re-iterate , Mrs Jalland's comment " James was fully convinced of the political value of uniformity , and so of the need for episcopacy in England and Scotland alike ; though neither he nor the episcopal party in the Kirk were apparently very clear in their minds exactly what the theological significance of episcopacy was " ( Apostolic Ministry op cit ) The whole drift of events , however, seems to disprove this .What matter could have had more thought ? The whole scope of this inquiry has showed by what tortuous paths the moderate elements had trodden to effect the 1610 accommodation .

Spottiswoode , as representing the other titulars, maintained " that they were willing to obey His Majesty's desire , and only feared that the Church of Scotland , because of old usurpations , might take this for a sort of subjection to the Church of England " ( Spottiswoode III p 209 ) .The king answered that " he had provided sufficiently

against that ; for neither should the Archbishop of Canterbury nor York have a hand in the business " .The objection of Lancelot Andrews that the titulars should be first ordained Deacon and Priest was overruled by Bancroft who maintained " there was no necessity for this , seeing that where bishops could not be had , the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful ; otherwise it might be doubted if there was any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches " .Abbot supported this view citing the case of St Ambrose and Nectarius who were not even baptised at the time of their election to the episcopate ( vide T.Hannan Church quarterly Review Jan 1911 pp406-ff ;Apostolic Ministry p419 ;Strype Whitgift vol. 3 p 185 ) .Mrs Jalland points out the similarity between Bancroft's attitude and that of Whitgift in the Traversell case .The titulars were thus consecrated per saltum in the Chapel of London House on Oct 21 st 1610 by the Bishops of London , Ely ,Rochester and Worcester . The form used was that " according to the Church of England " . James Melville curiously enough says that the Bishops were " solemnly inaugurat and consecrat with annoynting of oyle and other ceremonies , just according to English fashion and Pontifical Papists " ( Diary

Wodrow Soc pp803-4 ) .It is difficult to determine the sources of Melville's information .

The Bishops returned to Scotland in December and consecrated Archbishop Gladstones and with him the Bishop of Orkney .Why the Primate of St Andrews did not attend for consecration in London is a matter for some speculation .Calderwood states " Upon the Lords Day the 13 Januar, and upon the Lord's Day the 24 Februar , the rest of the Bishops were consecrated , some at St Andrews , and some at Leith " ( Calderwood p. 645 ) . It is interesting to find that " Fairfoul , Archbishop of Glasgow , and Hamilton , Bishop of Galloway , the other two bishops to be consecrated in London in 1661 had received deacon's and priest's orders at the hands of the 1610 episcopate , and these orders were of course considered valid " ( Apostolic Ministry note p 420 ) .Thus the per saltum consecrations ceased with those of 1610 .

The accommodation of Glasgow was , with some few alterations ratified by the Parliament of 1612 (Acta Parl Scot IV p 469 ; Calderwood pp 646-48 ) .

Thus the policy of Meville was both successful and unsuccessful by reason of the fact that it represented an extreme polity .Democratic in a feudal society it was not compatible with the growing absolutism of the monarchy and with a forced polity of uniformity between the two national churches which was involved in this absolutism.The growing tension led to ecclesiastical disorder especially dangerous in view of the Catholic Reaction .There was also an enlightened moderate party represented by such men as Patrick Simpson ,James with much worldly wisdom promoted , step by step , the evolution of the episcopate and there is evidence that he had , in his better moments , other than worldly designs .The imprisonment and banishment of the extremists was more than unfortunate but like the Papists their presence was disturbing to political equanimity at a most critical time .The accommodation of 1610 was suprisingly unanimous and secured the independence of the Scotch Church with its own courts and usages .It also secured the inter-communion of the two national churches . Peace prevailed and much constructive work was accomplished .The failure of the accommodation was due to the absolutism of the monarchy and the subservience of unenlightened minds within the episcopate .Prof. Cooper comments " Sad it is to think

how the toils and labours of these godly peace-makers were frustrated at the time , on the one hand through the meddling folly , however well meant , of two arbitrary monarchs , and through the political and religious bitterness thereby engendered , however naturally, on the other " ( Cooper Plea for Reunion p 59 ) .

Generally speaking we may say that the I6IO Accommodation has had great influence on modern movements of unity . We shall note later for example its effect upon the experiment in South India .Meanwhile it may be expedient to note the " Informal Conference " held in Aberdeen on Mar 18 th 1918 between representatives of the Church of Scotland , the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Scottish Episcopal Church , which reflects the influence of the work accomplished in I6IO .It was suggested as is done in the Archbishop's Cambridge Sermon , that there should be a pre-union " period of preparation " in which a definite date may be taken on which the Episcopal Church might adopt the system of Church Courts from Kirk Session to General Assembly , while permanent moderators of Presbyterian Synods might receive consecration as Bishops .As the " Moderator " bishops would recognise those ordained by them and the Presbytery as well as those ordained by the Presbytery alone there would be no doubts as to the validity of such orders . After the

period of incorporation such questions would cease to be of any consequence .It was further agreed that the Scottish Episcopal Church might " recognise " the strong hold which the complete system of Presbyterian Church Courts has on the Scottish people , as well as its many intrinsic advantages , and agree to their inclusion in the future United Church .

On the other hand might not the Presbyterians knowing the importance the other side attach to the ( historic episcopate ' and remembering that Andrew Melville's objection to Bishops was a later development in their own communion , be willing to give it its corresponding place ? " ( Memorandum " As a Basis for Similar Conferences Throughout Scotland " vide Cooper Plea p 101 ) . The 1610 accommodation clearly provides a precedent for this and other similar schemes .

## CHAPTER 4

---

### THE I610 ACCOMMODATION



The episcopal settlement of 1610 although receiving the approval of the General Assembly had as yet no legal authority . This was accordingly given to it by the Parliament which met at Edinburgh on Oct 12 th 1612 .The Act of 1592 dissolving the Titular Episcopate had not yet been repealed so that the ratification of the new episcopate was also most necessary ( Act Parl Scot IV p 469 ) . The Glasgow decisions confirmed were :

1. No General Assembly can be legally held without permission of the sovereign .
2. The Bishops to be moderators in every Diocesan Synod .
3. The Diocesan Synods to be held twice annually in every Diocese ; in the larger dioceses two or three Synods .
- 4 . In the absence of a bishop " a worthy minister bearing a charge within the bounds " shall supply the place of the Diocesan .The minister to be appointed by the Archbishop .
- 5 . No excommunication or absolution shall be pronounced without the knowledge and approbation of the Bishop of the Diocese who must be answerable to God and His Majesty for all formal and impartial proceeding therein.
- 6.The oath of allegiance and supremacy was declar-

ed imperative .

Calderwood points out that by this act the censure of the bishop by the Assembly was omitted and that " In the Article concerning the moderation of Diocesan Synods , the Bishop hath no power to substitute another to be Moderator in his absence . But by the ratification of this Parliament he may . And indeed if the Diocesan Synod and Episcopal Visitation be all one , as appeareth , then the explanation is right , and the Articles in the Act of Glasgow were contrived captiously , to circumvene the Assembly " ( Hist . p 646 ) . Such changes were obvious to the critical eyes of the Presbyterian party . Certainly Gladstones , the Primate , was hardly the man to persevere in a course of diplomatic moderation . Writing to James about the Parliament he calls Sir Thomas Hamilton of Priestfield , " my good Lord Secretary , the fourteenth Bishop of this Kingdom " ( ibid p 645 ) and James is described as " our great Archbishop " ( ibid p 646 ) . Indeed as Stephens comments : " Gladstones , who as primate ought to have had special qualifications for a position difficult to fill at any time , and doubly so at that time , was entirely devoid of administrative ability or tact . He was in every sense a . . .

mediocre man , and brought little credit to the Church during the few years of his primacy " ( Stephens Hist op cit p 206 ) .

On Feb. 9 th 1613 an attempt was made to incorporate the more extreme ministers into the new establishment .By a regal proclamation made at Edinburgh , largely through the influence of Spottiswoode , the " liberty " of attending the Synods and Presbyteries was offered to the " confined " ministers if they " would hereafter carry themselves in that dutiful obedience , which they owe his Majesty " ( Calderwood p 648 ) .It is doubtful if this move had much effect ( Lawson op cit p 322 ) .

Spottiswoode succeeded to the primacy in 1615 ; henceforth the ordering of the Church was to be in the hands of a man able if not successful .

The constitutional merits of absolutism as practised by James may be few but its practical effects were many and not entirely negative .In a speech delivered to the Estates in 1616 by Sir Thomas Hamilton .lord Binning , there is a detailed and horrifying picture of anarchy , bloodshed and national depravity .We are told : " The Islanders oppressed the Highlanders ; the Highlanders tyrannised over their Lowland neighbours ; the powerful and violent in the country domineered over the lives and goods of their weak neighbours..... and barbarities of all

all sorts were exercised in all parts ofv the country ,no place nor person being exemed or inviolable.Edinburgh being the ordinary place of butchery ,revenge and daily fights ..... ministers being dirked in Stirling ,buried alive in Clydesdale and murdered in Galloway " ( Balfour - Annates 2 - 7 ,16,18 ) .

James ' policy , arbitrary though it may have been, certainly reduced this disorder which declared Sir Thomas Hamilton , had been " abolished by your Majesty's care , power and expenses " . In the Parliament of 1617 " the King himself had a harangue , wherein he expressed the great desire he had to visit this Realme , to have the Kirk settled , the Kingdom reduced to good order , Lawes needing reformation reformed , for the good of the subjects " ( Calderwood p 675 ) . At the same time he could already claim that there that there had been" a preserving of peace and the keeping of the laws in due regard " ( The Melrose papers I- p 273 ; Burton Hist vol 6 pp15-16 ) . There was no justiciary upon which James had been able to rely ; if in these past years and in the future he was to use the Church as an instrument of his policy we cannot be entirely out of sympathy with this course .The Stewart despotism failed where the Tudor despotism succeeded , in

the substitution of force for influence. Prof .Trevelyan asserts :

" The keynote of Tudor government had been King- worship , not despotism .... the power of the Tudors , in short , was not material but metaphysical .They appealed sometimes to the love and always to the loyalty and ' free-awe ' of their subjects " ( Trevelyan History of England p 380 ) .This fact has some importance to the history of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation : the Tudors in identifying themselves with the Anglican settlement made it popular ; James by identifying himself with the Scottish settlement made it unpopular .The reduction of the outlying parts of the kingdom , the Isles , the Borders and the Highlands to some sort of order was undertaken with resolution . Of these " peccant " parts the taming of the " wicked blood of the Isles " is illustrative of the part played by the churchmen .Andrew Knox , Bishop of the Isles , accompanied Lord Stewart of Ochiltree who " found a valuable ally in his colleague the bishop " ( Hume Brown p 257 ) .Although the stratagem by which the chiefs were imprisoned is hardly compatible with episcopal function the treaty known as the " Band and Statutes of Icolmkill " began a new era in the history of the Western Isles .Amongst the terms were those stipulating that churches were to be repaired and a parochial ministry to be established ( P.C. Reg. IX - 24-30 ) .Bishop Knox was then appointed Steward

and Justice of all the North and West Isles of Scotland (Gregory p. 333 ) .A similar commission was given to James Law , Bishop of the Orkneys and Shetlands .This prelate's dealings with Earl Patrick Stewart are illustrative of the times .From the Reformation until the appointment of Bishop Law in 1605 there had been no regular religious ministrations in the Islands . Bishop Bothwell had little more than financial interest in his diocese . The leases of the Earldom of Orkney also procured by him reverted to the Crown in 1544.Lord Robert Stewart ,however, had exchanged the Abbacy of Holyroodhouse with Bothwell for the Bishopric of Orkney and in time he came to possess both bishopric and Earldom .He was created Earl of Orkney in 1581 to which his son , Patrick , succeeded in 1600.Although in nominating Law to the see in Feb. 1605 the King granted a renunciation of the episcopal revenues , the bishop had to come to a compromise by which he resigned the lands and revenues of the see to the Earl for the duration of his incumbency in exchange for an annuity.The arrangement did not work out well .The Earl continued to be tyrannous and oppressive .The bishop felt he had to protest .Accordingly the Privy Council took action ; on Aug.2<sup>nd</sup> 1610 he was brought to trial .He was accused of detaining the dependents " in irons , stocks , close prison and firminance , divers days and weeks , usurping thereby our royal authority, and bereaving our lawful subjects of their native liberty due

to them , in their free passage and traffic , under our peace and protection through all parts of our native kingdom by sea and land " .Also , " leaving no sort of extraordinary oppression and treasonable violence unpractised against the said inhabitants of Orkney and Zetland at the times specially above rehearsed , at the least in divers of the years and months aforesaid, had compelled the most part of the gentleman's tenants of the said countries of Orkney and Zetland to work to him in all manner of work by sea and land , in rowing and sailing his ships and boats , working in the stone quarries , winning and bearing forth thereof stones , and shallops with the stone and lime , and loosing the same ; building his parks and dykes , and all other sorts of servile and painful labour , without either meat , drink or hire " ( Pitcairns Criminal Trials of Scotland vol. III pp 81-87 , 308-27 ) .The matter was further complicated by the fact that until 1611 the islands were still under Danish Law .In 1614 the Earl incensed by his continued imprisonment sent his illegitimate son to re-possess his holding and in this he was partially successful .During this process Bishop Law stood firm to save the beautiful little cathedral of St Magnus ,Kirkwall which was in danger of demolition .The Earl of Orkney was executed on Feb. 1 st 1615 .By a Crown Charter of Oct 4 th 1614 a complete and entire seperation was effected between the Earldom and the Bishopric : the Bishops were to

plant churches providing sufficient stipends for the clergy  
 ( A. Peterkin , Notes on Orkney and Zetland vol. I pp46 ,138 ,140 ;  
 Acta parl Scot. IV p 481 , III - p 461-5 ) .This last of the  
 feudal tyrants is described by Calderwood as being " so ignorant  
 that he could scarce rehearse the Lord's Prayer " ( Calderwood  
 VII pp 194-5 ) . This interesting information seems to be miss-  
 ing in the 1778 text ) . Apparently the execution took place  
 against the wish of " the wiser and elder sort of the nobilitie."  
 The incident seems to indicate the close relationship existing  
 between the policy of James and the instruments of that policy.  
 To the inexorable James order was essential; can we  
 doubt that it was the most blessed gift to that time ? It  
 seems to have been natural to the mind of the King that the  
 episcopate could assist in its distribution . It was indeed an  
 idea which might win our respect if not assent .

As yet the Scottish Church had no authoritative  
 statement of belief , canons of discipline , nor liturgy .The  
 Confession of Faith as introduced by Knox was the only stand-  
 ard accepted yet this had no legal sanction .The 1552 Prayer  
 Book had been used by Knox and succeeded by his own Book which  
 was apparently used at the clergyman's discretion ( Preface  
 by Bishop M.Russell -Spottiswoode Soc. Edit Hist 1847 pp88) .  
 On his visit to London made in 1615 Spottiswoode had discussed  
 this matter with the King and far from being subservient had



said " These things must be advised and agreed upon in a general assembly of the clergy which must be drawn to the form of the convocation house here in England " ( Grub 2- p 305 ) .Actually a Confession of Faith had been submitted to the Archbishop in 1612 and had been compiled under the direction of John Hall and John Adamson ( Book of the Universal Kirk II-II25-9 ) ,

It was to deal with these matters that a General Assembly was held in Aberdeen on Aug. 13 th 1616 . As primate Spottiswoode presided with the Earl of Montrose as Royal Commissioner.The main enactments were :

1. " the simple Confession of the Faith underwritten be universally received throughout this whole kingdom , to the which all hereafter shall be bound to swear , and set their hand ; and in special all persons , that bear office in the Church ...
2. No man should be permitted to practice medicine unless he first satisfy his bishop touching his religion .
3. That an uniform order of Liturgy or Divine Service , be set down to be read in all Kirks , on the ordinary days of prayer , and every Sabbath day before Sermon , to the end that the Common people may be acquaint therewith , and by custom may learn to serve God rightly .

4. It is thought most necessary and expedient, that there be an uniformity of Church Discipline , throughout all the Kirks of this Kingdom ; and to that effect it is ordained , that a book of Canons be made , and published in print , drawn forth of the books of the former Assemblies ; and where the same is defective , that it be supplied by Canons of Councils and Ecclesiastical Conventions , in former times .

5. It is statute and ordained , that the Archbishops and Bishops , in the Visitation of the Kirk , either by themselves , or where they cannot overtake the business , the Minister of the Parish , make all young children of six years of age be presented before them , to give the Confession of Faith , that so it may appear in what Religion they have been trained up . After that trial , that the minister of the Parish , every two or three years once at the least thereafter , re- examine them , that after sufficient growth in knowledge , they may be admitted to the Holy Communion .

6. Grammar schools be established .

7 . Every minister should keep a parish register

of baptisms , marriages and burials " .

The Confession of Faith comprising fifty-three articles bear much similarity to the **Thirty**nine Articles but still remain Calvinistic ;

Art 7 : " Albeit all mankind be fallen in Adam ; yet only these who are elected before all time , are in time redeemed ... through faith in Jesus Christ .

Art 34 : " We believe , that the Sacraments are to be ministered only by them , who are lawfully called thereto by the Kirk of God " .

Art 46&7 : " We believe , that there is an holy Catholic or Universal Church , which is the Holy Company of all those , who , according to the purpose of God's election since the beginning of the world , will be called to the Kingdom of Christ , and to the Communion of Eternal Life in him .

We believe , that the true members of this church , are only the faithful , who are chosen to Life Eternal. This Church we believe to be but one , and that out of it there is no remission of sins to salvation ."

Art 48 : " We believe , that this Kirk is partly triumphant in heaven , partly militant in the earth .The whole militant Kirk on earth is divided in many and diverse Particular Kirks , which are visible and Conspicuous to the eyes of men " .

Art 49 : " We believe not , that all those particular

Kirks are pure , but these only which continue in the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles , according to the Holy Canonical Scripture , worshipping God purely , and ministering the Sacraments according to the same : and these be the marks , whereby a true Kirk on earth may be discerned " ( Calderwood pp668<sup>2</sup> 73 ) .

The Articles did not involve an abrogation of the Confession .Lawson maintains " it was most **probably** intended , from its minute details , to be the great test of renouncing the Roman Catholic faith , for we find that the Marquis of Huntly subscribed it when he was absolved from the sentence of excommunication " ( Lawson p 361 ).The Fifty -Three Articles make no mention of church discipline;it is possible that Spettiswoode still hopeful of an accommodation did not press the matter . The scheme for Confirmation seems to suggest this .Prof .Cooper comments : " Not even under this Episcopacy would the Church tie Confirmation to the Episcopate , and for this too some ancient authority may be pleaded " ( Cooper Plea for Reunion p 50 ) . Episcopal Confirmation was not practised during the next twenty-years or during the post Restoration Interim .It was not even practised in the dis-established Episcopal Church until the early part of the last century ( G.W.Sprott - Worship & Offices of the Church of Scotland p 85 ) .In the Channel Islands ( where Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation

worked well as long as it was allowed to do so ) confirmation by a Bishop was not the practice until 1829 . By then the churches there had been united to the Church of England for nearly one hundred years .

The king accepted the acts of Aberdeen except that on Confirmation which he described as " a mere hotch-potch , and not so clear as was requisite " .The articles certainly left the matter vague .It is significant that in the 1615 discussions with James , Spottiswoode had mentioned the need for an order for the election of bishops and ministers " in time hereafter " . This suggestion , had it been accepted by James would have established a Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation on liberal lines but he knew his man and was obviously prepared to wait

( Grub 2- p 305 ,Sprott Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI intro p 15 ) .The Primate at this time seems to have wished these schemes to be as constitutional as possible i.e. approved by the General Assembly and he seems to have had ideas of remodelling the assembly on lines of the English Convocation ( Stephen p 215 ) .Whether this was a wise hope it is difficult to determine . The Lower House might have proved an effective

check on an Upper House of Bishops .The idea may well have appealed to the extreme Presbyterian party . In his acceptance of the Aberdeen enactments the King submitted a draft addition of the Five Articles :

1. Kneeling for reception of the Holy Communion.
  2. Private communion of the sick .
  3. Private baptism in urgent necessity .
  4. Observance of Christmas Day , Good Friday , Easter , Ascension and Whitsun .
  5. Episcopal Confirmation .
- ( Spottiswoode 3 - pp236- 7 ) .

Spottiswoode advised against their inclusion until they had been before the General Assembly .To this the king assented suspending consideration until his personal visit the following year . To Hewison Spottiswoode was the " timorous Primate " ( The Covenanters Vol. I p 193 ) but in this case he was evidently otherwise .

The preparation for the royal visit were typical of the king's character ; he would show the Puritans of his beloved Scotland how a church ought to look .accord-

ingly English carpenters landed at Leith " In repairing the Royal Chapel of the Palace of Holyroodhouse , beside the place which was prepared for the Organs , and the Choiristers to sing , there were also carved Statues of the Twelve Apostles , and the Four Evangelists , curiously wrought in timber , to be gilded , and set up " ( Calderwood p 673 ) . The Dean of the Chapel Royal , William Cowpar , bishop of Galloway , together with the Primate and the Bishops of Aberdeen , Brechin and some of the Edinburgh ministers protested against these innovations as doubtful expedients ( Spottiswood 5 - pp258-9 ) . The King consented to see that the ornaments were omitted although " calling our skaring at them , scandalum acceptum , sed non datum " ( Calderwood p 674 ) . Obeying his " salmon like instinct " James entered Scotland on an unlucky day , May 13 th 1617 . Then " Upon the Saturday the seventeenth of May , the English service , singing of choiristers , and playing on Organs , and surplices were first heard and seen in the Chapel Royal " . ( ibid p 674 ) . On June 8 th " the Communion was to be celebrat after the English forme " ( ibid ) . The elements were administered to the kneeling communicants but the Dean of the Chapel , the Bishop of Galloway , refused to receive in this posture but continued not long in that minde " . Lancelot Andrews , Bishop of Ely , the shining light of Anglicanism accompanied the king and with him a rising star , Dr William Laud , Dean of Gloucester . The latter

speedily offended the ever watchful eyes of Edinburgh mourners by putting on his surplice for the burial of one of the English guard ( Nichols Progresses , Processions , and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First , Lond . 1838 vol. 3 p 344 ).

Parliament met on June 15 th and the proceedings were honoured by the King on the 17 th . In his speech he was pleased to say " that if the Scottish nation would be as docile to learn the goodness of England as they are teachable to limp after their ill , he might with facility prevail in his desire ; for they had learned of the English to drink healths , to wear couches and gay clothes , to take tobacco , and to speak neither Scottish nor English " ( ibid p 347-8 ) . One can imagine the effect of this tactful effusion ; certainly James had lost his Scottish caution in thirteen years of absence . He was not making the Primate's task any easier . The first act of this Parliament regulated the election of Bishops . " The king's nomination shall be " none other than an actual minister " . The Second Act related to the reconstitution of Chapters to whom in most cases , all temporalities were to be restored . The Primate was to be " elected " by the Chapter consisting of the Bishops



Dunkeld ,Aberdeen ,Breachin , Dunblane ,Ross , Moray ,Orkney , and Caithness , the Principal of St Leonard's College , the Archdean and Vicar of St Andrews and the Vicars of Leuchars and Cupar -Fife .The Bishop of Dunkeld was to be Vicar-General . The Chapter for election to the Archbishopric of Glasgow was vested in the Bishops of Galloway ,Argyll and the Isles and most of the Glasgow Chapter .The Bishop of Galloway was to be convenor of the elections . Another Act promulgated the formation of a commission " anent the plantation of kirks " and to take generous measures for the maintainence of the ministry. A Sixth Act " anent furnishing of neccessaries for ministering of the sacraments " ordered that all parish kirks should have basins for Baptism , cups , tables and table -clothes for the Holy Communion ( Acta Parl Scot vol. IV pp 529-30 ) . The first article proposed by the lords , under royal influence , defined the regal supremacy over causes : " Whatsoever conclusion was taken by his Majesty with advice of the archbishop -s and bishops in matters of external policy , the same should have power and strength of an ecclesiastical law " . It is of interest to observe that the bishops were , at this stage opposed to the articles .An amendment was added to the effect that the episcopate should be assisted by " a competent number of the ministry " ( Lawson p 374 ) . James had argued " To have matters ruled as they have been in your General

Assemblies I will never agree , for the bishops must rule the ministers , and the king rule both , in matters indifferent and not repugnant to the Word of God " ( vide Stephen vol. 2 p 220 ) .

This naturally resulted in a protestation that the freedom of the Church had been imperilled ( Calderwood p 677 ) .Amongst the fifty -five who signed this was Calderwood .He was later banished for his part in the affair .That the bishops finally accepted the principle of conge D' elire meant a marked deterioration in the prospects of an accommodation .

On July 13 th the King had addresseda convention of the bishops and thirty-six ministers at St Andrews ( Hume Brown op cit p 268 ) He put before them the necessity of adopting the Five Articles assuring them with typical logic : " I mean not to do any thing against reason , but on the other hand, my demands being just and religious , you must not think that I will be refused or resisted " ( Spottiswoode 3- pp 245- 7 ) .After a two hours discussion the convention requested the king that the matter might be put before a General Assembly . Through the good offices of Patrick

Galloway the King finally consented .Accordingly the General Assembly was fixed for Nov. 25 th .Meanwhile the King had left Scotland arriving at Carlisle on Aug. 4 th .

The St Andrews Assembly was an uneasy gathering . Other fears besides that of the winter storms had kept many absent .Amongst other things : " Seven Dioceses,as we were informed , were absent , and that through default of timely warning " ( Calderwood p 689 ) .The opening sermons set the temper of the Assembly : " Mr Gladstones , Archdean of St Andrews , teaching in the morning , exhorted the Brethren of the Ministry to do nothing , which might procure the stopping of their mouths . St Andrews , teaching before noon , alleged that our first Reformers had in effect embraced Episcopal Government many years , and had continued the same , if the death of the Regent , the Earl of Mar , had not intervened ; and that a seditious fiery man Mr Andrew Melville came home to disturb all good order " ( ibid p 689 ) .

The Assembly would be forced to no definite conclusion ( Spottiswoode bk 7 ) except the possibility of allowing Communion of the sick ( Calderwood p 689 ) .As a result of this

the King wrote to the Archbishops expressing his dissatisfaction and adding a postscript : " Since your Scottish Church hath so far contemned my clemency , they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a King upon them " .In a private letter of Dec. 11 th the King wrote to Spottiswoode ordering the cancellation of stipends to those ministers refusing the Five Articles ( Ban. Club Original Letters 1603 - 27 ) .

The Bishops continued to prepare for the adoption of the suggested practices : " The Bishop of St Andrews preached in the great Kirk of Edinburgh upon the 25 th of December , and laboured to prove the observation of festal days to be lawful .Mr William Cowper , Bishop of Galloway , preaching as Dean of the Chapel Royal in the Chapel , where there was playing upon Organs. So the Bishops practised novations , before ever they were embraced by any General Assemblies " ( Calderwood p 691 ) . On Jan. 28 th the Greater Festivals were proclaimed to be observed by all ( ibid p. 692 ) ." Upon Easter day , the Communion was celebrated by sundry Bishops in their Cathedral Kirks with kneeling , especially at St Andrews " ( ibid p 696 ) .

The stage was being set for a struggle that was to create a deep division in the Scottish Church .Spottiswoode had read the King's letter on Jan. 26 th or 29 th to the clergy

at St Giles' . On July 10 th the King granted the licence for the Assembly that opened in Perth on Aug. 25 th .It was to be the last for twenty years . The previous six months had been a time of anxiety, and preparation for the episcopal and presbyterian parties . In particular the " zealous Brethren of the ministry in Fife " had urged the Synods to take no action on the Articles " No Synod may , or ought to call in question, Innovation , or Annul the Acts of the General Assembly " ( Calderwood p 696 ) .

For the purposes of this inquiry the general tenor of the sermons opening the crucial assemblies have proved of some interest . Bishop Forbes , pupil and one of the numerous relatives of Andrew Melville , preached in the morning stating " that nothing should be done nor determined in the Church by any Superior power whatsoever but that which is according to the Commandment of their Almighty King " ( ibid p 698 ) . Spottiswoode preached later a sermon lasting two hours the text being from Cor. I-ii v 16 " But if any man seem to be contentious , we have no such custom , neither the Churches of God " . After defending the Five Articles from the practice " of the best Reformed Churches " he denied they " came by the suggestion of the English Church , or of ourselves at home " . He also asserted

" I , therefore , in the presence of Almighty God and of this honourable Assembly , solemnly protest that without my knowledge , against my desire , and when I least expected , these Articles were sent unto me not to be proposed to the Church , but to be inserted among the Canons thereof , which were then ingathering; touching which point I humbly excused myself , that I could not insert among the Canons that which was not first advised by the Church , and desired they might be referred to another convention . So as I spake before , I would , if it had been in my power, most willingly have declined the receiving of these Articles ; not that I did esteem them either unlawful or inconvenient , for I am so far persuaded of the contrary as I can be of any thing , but I foresaw the contradiction which would be made and the business we should fall into . Therefore let no man deceive himself. These things proceed from his Majesty , and are his own motions , not any others " . In conclusion the Assembly was reminded : " The Kingdom of God consists not in them ( the Five Articles ) but in righteousness , and peace , and joy in the Holy Ghost . Away with fruitless and contentious disputings. Remember the work we are sent for is to build the Church of God , and not to destroy it ; to call men to faith and repentance ; to stir them up to the works of true piety and love , and not to make them think they have religion enough when they have talked against Bishops and

and ceremonies " ( Lawson pp 592-3 ; Calderwood p 698 ) .These sentiments may give some idea of the position of two of the most able of the episcopate .Clearly they were not unaware of the dangers confronting the accommodation .The fire of Melville was, however , not quenched .George Grier , Minister of Knox's native place questioned the Primate's assumption of the Moderatorship .When Grier " desired that the order of free election might be kept " . The Bishop " answered saucily , the Assembly was convened within the bounds , wherein so long as he served , he trusted no man would take his place .No farther reply was made to him , for fear of trouble " ( Calderwood p 699 ) .

The King's Letter presented by Young ,Dean of Winchester , was then read aloud .It began by saying " We were once more fully resolved never in our time to have called any more Assemblies there , for ordering things concerning the Policie of the Church , by reason of that disgrace offered to us in that late meeting at St Andrews , wherein our just and Godly desires were not only neglected .....".Spottiswoode then argued that in the case of their refusal to accept the Articles " the whole Estate and Order of our Kirk would be overthrown " . Further , " I know when some of you are banished , and others deprived , ye will blame us , and call us persecutors .But we will lay all the burden upon the King , and if ye call him a

persecutor , all the world will stand up against you " ( ibid p 701 ) .It would seem that the Primate's policy was not so Erastian as we are sometimes led to believe : " I must tell you that the evil of innovation , especially in matters of rite and ceremony , is nothing so great as the evil of disobedience ..... but if that which is decreed be not repugnant to the Word , and that thou hast no more than thine own influences and motions of conscience , as thou calledst it , how strong however thy persuasions be , it is presumption in thee to disobey the ordinance of the Church ; and of this we may be sure , that whoever denies obedience to Church ordinances in things indifferent , the same will not stick to reject God's own Word , when it crosses his fancy " ( History Preface XC - XCII ) .The struggle was now defined ; the theological bias of the extreme Presbyterian party was supplemented by political considerations . It is significant that the Archbishop had to mention the " pamphlett written by some perverse spirit in the English Church , whose argument had found too good a reception among some ministers in Scotland " ( ibid XCV ) .But this " alliance " was not sufficient to cancel the negative effect of Young's appearance , Scot though he was .The Primate himself had protested at the intrusion of Abbot into the matter of Huntly's excommunication ; it is not unlikely that Young's part in the Assembly would be viewed in a similar light ( vide



Spottiswoode Book 7 for the context of this discussion ) .  
 When the vote came to be taken Calderwood states that the  
 questions were asked " Will ye consent to these Articles ,  
 or disobey the King ? " ( Calderwood p 713 ) .No matter  
 the truth of this ; there is no better commentary upon the  
 position in 1617 ,There was a majority of two to one in favour  
 of the Articles , whilst the ministerial vote was about  
 equal there being forty- five ministers against the motion  
 and acceptance .That there was this opposition showed that the  
 storm clouds were not to be dispelled by the dazzling light  
 of the Crown and Sceptre ( Calderwood ibid ) .

The Five Articles were now drafted as maintain-  
 ing :

1. That the sacrament of Holy Communion be  
 received kneeling .
2. That it might be administered in private to  
 the sick .
3. That baptism might be administered at home  
 in cases of dire necessity .
4. That all the children of eight years be  
 confirmed or " blessed " by the Bishop .
5. That the five great Festivals of the  
 Christian Year be observed.

( Book of the Universall Kirk 3- 1165 ) .

It is interesting to observe that the Articles make no mention of the Confirmation of adults .

The Articles were ratified by the Privy Council on Oct 21 st 1618 ( Spottiswoode 2 - pp 252-7 ) .This same year Calvinism had triumphed over Arminianism at the Synod of Dort .The " British " churches were represented but do not seem to have there condemned the Perth Articles as suggested by the extreme Presbyterians ( Collier vol. 7 pp 408-16 ) .That the adoption of these Articles in some form or other has now become a frequent practice of those within the Church of Scotland is proof that they are not alien to the Presbyterian tradition ( J.Cooper Plea for Reunion p 51 ) .The manner of their authorisation certainly made them appear so for many generations ( Calderwood pp 724- 52 ; P.C. Register Vols II & I2 ) .At a meeting of the Kirk -Session of Perth on Mar 5 th 1619 we find " Proposition being made , if they will agree and consent that the Lord's Supper be celebrated in the burgh conform to the prescription of the Act of the General Assembly made thereanent last holden at Perth or not viz that the ministers give the wine and bread with their own hands to the communicants , and that they be humbled on their knees , and reverently receive it ; all being voted , all agreed in one that the celebration thereof be made according to the said act " .

For the service : " The tables were placed in the choir or east part of the church .The communicants were to enter in the morning by the south door , where to add to the solemnity , and do honour to the occasion, several of the Magistrates and others were to stand in due form with their elders .The communicants were there to give their tokens along with their alms , and then to pass either directly to the tables , or to seats in the choir allotted for them .Such as were not to communicate , at least on the first day of the communion , were to enter the church by the north door , and were to give their alms .After the consecration of the elements the minister , followed by the bearers of the bread and wine , was to go through the tables , giving as he went along , the elements with his own hands to each of the communicants kneeling ; after which they who had communicated would depart from the table , and be succeeded by such as were next to communicate " ( Kirk -Session Records of Perth Vol. I mss Advocate 's Lib.Edin ) .At Edinburgh " the nobles , councillors , and sessioners came first to the Table , and all upon their knees received the elements from the ministers. Their example was generally followed by the congregation , so that neither man nor woman , during the space of four hours , offered to receive the sacrament sitting , except one base

fellow " ( Original Letters , James the Sixth Ban. Club 1619 ).  
 In the same city on Easter Day 1620 : " When an honest woman  
 had divided that part of the bread , which she had received ,  
 that she might give a part to the next Mr Walter Struthers ,  
 ministering in the College Kirk , pulled it out of her hand ,  
 as she was lifting it to her mouth , and gave her a portion  
 out of his own hand " ( Calderwood p 753 ) .By Oct 1635 we  
 find the Synod of Moray reporting that " All had given the  
 communion out of their own hands unto their people sitting  
 reverently on their knees according to the order set down in  
 Parliament " ( Extracts Synod of Moray Elgin 1906 edit.  
 W. Cramond pp 37-8 ) . To defeat the possibility of continuing  
 opposition James ordered a parliament to meet at Edinburgh on  
 June 1 st 1621 . By this the Articles were legalised ( Acta  
 Parl . Scot. 1621 c I-IV p 596 ) .Meanwhile the extreme  
 Presbyterian party had been weakened by the death , banishment  
 and incarceration of their leaders : James Melville ( who had  
 married the Vicar's daughter episcopalian though she might be )  
 died at Berwick in 1614 ; Walter Balcanqual in 1616 ; Andrew  
 Melville ( and who can explain this eclipse ? ) at Sedan in  
 1622 ; John Welsh had died in London the same year. John Forbes  
 was in exile ; Bruce was " silenced " in Inverness ; Calderwood  
 found refuge in Holland after imprisonment .Clearly the King's  
 policy was one of enforced uniformity .

There was still the Moderate Party of whom Patrick Galloway is representative : " It was observed , that Mr Patrick himself bowed the one leg , had the sole of his other upon the ground , and sat withall upon the form , when he received the elements " ( Calderwood p 796 ) .Although this posture might well have been due to the more carnal moderation of old age perhaps it is symbolic of the genuine attempt made by such men to secure the peace of the Church .As Stephen remarks : " It should not be forgotten that the Scottish Church had retained within its bounds from the Reformation downwards men of two different schools , and that while each side struggled , and not always scrupulously , for mastery over the other , there was no actual separation into opposite camps until the Revolution of 1688-89 .this has to be borne in mind in reading the History of the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Revolution " ( History op cit vol. 2 p 228 ) .

The death of James on Mar 27 th 1625 was not to close but to open a new chapter in the history of Presbyterian - Episcopal Accommodation .

## CHAPTER 5

---

### THE FATE OF THE 1610 EPISCOPATE

Many of the monarchs of England have been theologically inclined .Charles I was no exception; his brother had wanted him to accept another throne , the cathedra of Canterbury ( Terry op cit p 3II ) .When he was proclaimed King in Scotland some four days after the death of his father the people knew that yet another monarch , baptised a presbyterian was to be their ruler .He was ,however but four years of age when he was carried down to his father's court in London .He was thirty-three when he re-visited Scotland in 1633 ; his only other visit was made in 1641 and then to rally the last upholders of a tottering regality .It seems clear , therefore , that his policy of cuius regio eius religio would have to be expressed through an agency and that agency was the episcopate .It will be of interest to this inquiry to examine the individual contributions made by these agents in furthering this policy ; and to see if inspite of the limitations imposed , they were able to exercise any influence on Presbyterian - Episcopal Accommodation. This , it would seem , cannot be rightly interpreted without an examination of the broad outline of events terminating in the Revolution of 1688 .

By what logic had the Stewarts come to their ecclesiastical absolutism ? Queen Elizabeth could assert " We are by

this authority bound to direct all estates , being subject to us , to live in the faith , and the obedience of Christian religion , and to see the laws of God and man which are ordained to that end to be duly observed and the offenders against the same duly punished , and consequently to provide that the Church may be governed and taught by archbishops , bishops and ministers according to the ecclesiastical ancient policy of the realm , whom we do assist with our sovereign power ..... An office and charge as we think properly due to all Christian monarchs and princes sovereigns , whereby they only differ from pagan princes that only take care of their subject's bodies without respect to the salvation of their souls , or of the life hereafter to come " ( A Declaration of the Quenn's Proceedings since Her Reigh Church Hist. Soc . No IV p 41 -3 ) .But , as we have seen the secret of the Tudor despotism and its successful issues was that it was an expression of the popular will .The Christian Laity " asserted itself in the first year of Queen Elizabeth' by overriding the will of the ~~hierarchy~~ .When the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury presented the mind of the clergy and passed resolutions in favour of the Mass and the Pope's jurisdiction and declaring that laymen could not properly meddle with questions of faith , sacraments or ecclesiastical discipline , which were for the Clergy ;these resolutions were taken to the Bishops , and Bonner ( there being no



Archbishop and he being Bishop of London ) presented the Resolution to the Lord Keeper , by whom they were graciously received and then laid aside " ( Sir Lewis Dibdin - Dean of the Arches - Establishments in England London 1932 p 4 ; Cardwell's Synodalia 1842 vol. 2 pp 492-4 ) . But the Tudor stabilisation was a delicate matter ; the balance was dressed with a sagacious delicacy of touch . Would it be too superficial a generalisation to say " The Tudors led ; the Stewarts drove " ? Is it possible to reconcile this assertion with the Restoration of 1660 ? The Commonwealth might have been a necessary settlement but the divisions it entailed could never make it a popular one . In considering the re-establishment of the Church we must view as significant the statement that by 1676 all the Dissenters ( including the Roman Catholics ) were in the proportion to members of the Church of England as one to twenty ( Perry Student's Church History 2 nd Period p 522 ) .

Why was it otherwise in Scotland ? Dean Church had shown in his pamphlet " On the Relations between Church and State " that the relations may be summarised thus :

1. The King able and willing to protect the Church.
- 2 . The Church having its own laws requiring to be protected . ( vide Dibdin p 86 ) .

It was the failure of the Stewarts that they fulfilled to excess the first condition . It was the bitter sorrow of the Church in

Scotland that as yet the second relationship was impossible through lack of formulation and free volition .

The first conduct of Charles seemed to encourage the hope that the Perth Articles would be the limit of innovation ( Terry op cit p. 314 ) .He advised the Bishops not to enforce them on those already ordained ; the ministers banished or imprisoned for non-compliance were to be restored providing they were not in active opposition to them .Those newly ordained were to serve them ( Balfour Works vol 2 pp 142-45 ) .There seemed to be no rigid enforcement of uniformity .In fact " it was sad to hear pulpit against pulpit " ( Row's History p. 350 ) .Aiton , Presbyterian as he was , gives his opinion " If Spottiswoode's mild measures had been persevered in till all the old heads of Presbyterianism who had previous to the Perth Assembly , preached against conformity , died out , and till the young were either mollified by kindness , or altogether disregarded , Prelacy might have been fairly rooted in our soil , and come to as full growth in Scotland as it has done in England " ( vide Lawson p 427 ; Dr A.J.Mason The Church of England and Episcopacy p 511 ) .The bishops seemed to have acted with fatherly moderation and the synods and presbyteries still met .We find no undue " oversight " on the part of the episcopate .In the Synod of Moray dated Oct 25 th 1625 we read of a " Synod holden within the kirk

of Forres by Mr Gavin Dunbar , chantour of Murray Deputt Moderator by the Bishop at his going to the southe , Nain found absent bot five " ( W.Crammond Extracts op cit p 10 ) .Again " 24 th and 25 th April 1627 , holden at Elgin by ane reverend father in God , John Bishop of Murray and the brethren of the ministrie within the said diocie .Name found absent " ( ibid p 19 ) .In Oct 1635 " My Lord Bishop with the advys of the Synod ordens that through the whole dyocie ther be weikly catechising of the people " ( ibid p 37 ) .The accommodation in actual practice does not seem to indicate an undue subservience to Anglican innovations : on Oct 1 st 1633 " The Moderator of the presbytery of Strathbogie regrated unto the Synod that Jo. Leyth chamberland to the Marquess of Huntly and Robert Gordoun , in Bocharne , had come in unto the Kirk of Gairtlie on ane day of presbteriall meiting and had given unreverent and outrageous words unto the brethren or presbiterie and lykwys on Robert Rind who did the same and also affirmed that he was in the King's religion and that he would not come to the Kirk till he should see ane surplis and ane altar .The Synod concludes that they would shew the same unto the Archbishop and ordenes that in the meantyme Robert Rhind be processed with excommunication " .On April 28 th 1634 : " My Lord Bishop reported that he had advysed with the Archbishop concerning the Marquess of Huntly his servants who had not

kept the kirk " ( ibid pp 55-6 ) .That there was , however , lack of harmony among the laity can be adduced from evidence presented in the Kirk Session Records of this period ( e.g. Selections of the Kirk Session , Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen - Spalding Club pp 101 ff ) .

In 1620 " The Forme and Manner of ordaining ministers , and of consecrating of archbishops and bishops , used in the Church of Scotland " had been published by royal command .The Ordinal was based on that of the Anglican form but had no provision for the Diaconate ( Miscellany Wodrow Soc. Edin 1847 pp 597 ff - .Printed by Thomas Finlason 1620 ) .It seems that inspite of this an English form was used for when in 1661 Sharp ,Leighton ,Fairfoul and Hamilton were consecrated in London , the two former were ordained per omnia ecclesiastica officia promoti.The orders of the two latter were apparently considered valid as they " had received deacon's and priest's orders at the hands of the 1610 episcopate ( Apostolic Ministry p 420 ) .It seems that we ought to receive this evidence with some reserve for Sheldon , who raised the objection was at variance with the position of men like Sancroft over the policy to be used in respect to the ordination of Dissenters generally ( Dean Plumptree Thomas Ken Vol. I note p 130 ) .The circumstances it would seem were unlike those of 1610 and against concession

of any kind .Hamilton and Fairfoul are supposed to have told Sheldon that they were ordained before 1638 and therefore in episcopal orders ( Wodrow 's Analecta 1842 Vol. I p 90 ) .On the other hand it is not specially mentioned that they had been ordained through the diaconate .In 1638 Maxwell, admittedly one of the " High-Flyers " was charged amongst other things that he " consecrated deacons " ( Baillie's Letters and Journals Laing mss vol. I p 155 ff ) .Cowpar apparently ordained his secretary, Scott , sitting up in bed .This was the old man's last office ( Lawson p 413 ) .John Forbes of Corse mentions that by 1630 the order of deacons had lapsed ( Theologicae Moralis 1632 VIII th Commandment Sect.Sacrilege ) . We have no evidence that Patrick Forbes , later Bishop of Aberdeen , was ordained to the diaconate when at the age of forty-eight he was ordained presbyter by Bishop Blackburn .That there was no specific mention of the diaconate in the 1610 Ordinal is of some significance to our inquiry .It would seem that there was an attempt to graft the episcopal system on to the old polity ( G.W. Sprott Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland p 204 ) . On April 26 th 1626 " The Synod haring haid and considered ane supplication givin in unto them be the elders and gentlemen of the parouchin of Keithe regratting thair desolatioun through want of ane ordinar pastour the Synod eftir adwys ordanes the brethren of the exercises of Straithboggie to gang per vices to the Kirk of Keithe and

minister unto that people the word of consolatiuon untill it sall  
 pleis God in his mercie to provyd them with ane ordinar minister "  
 ( Synod of Moray Extracts op cit p 16 ) . The use of the word elder  
 in relation to office is more specifically mentioned in another  
 record of the Kirk Session of Aberdeen for 1662 ( June 30 th )  
 where there is mention of the " magistrattis , ministers , eldaris,  
 and deacons of the sessioun of this burht " ( Spalding Club Rec-  
 ords Kirk S<sub>e</sub>ssion , Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen p 103 ) , Thus  
 the old offices of the Presbyterian polity still seem to be in  
 being . The facts seem to lead us to suppose that the eight years  
 between the death of James and the ill fated visit of Charles was  
 a time in which Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation was becoming  
 an accomplished fact ( Row History p 326 ; Mathieson op cit vol  
 I - p 322 ; J. Cooper Plea for Reunion p 84 where he makes the  
 statement " we shall keep our Lay Eldership , which the Scots  
 Episcopal Church retained till well on in the eighteenth century ) .

The 1610 Ordinal required no subscription to a  
 Confession beyond that of allegiance to the Holy Scriptures. There  
 was , and this is of some significance , an oath involving the  
 King's Supremacy ; a declaration of perpetual residence and the  
 declaration against simony ( Wodrow Misc. vol. I p 591 ) .

Of necessity the polity of national churches is not  
 unaffected by the economic systems contributing to their well-

being in temporal concerns .When Charles , highminded and high-handed , set in motion the machinery resulting in the Act of Revocation it was to be " the ground stone of all the mischief that followed after , both to this king's government and family" ( Balfour vol. 2 p 128 ) . By this act the King intended to ensure the establishment of the Church Episcopal and it must be confessed , Caroline ( Acta Parl Scot. V p 218 ff ) .The old Titular system was now abolished ; henceforth the stipends of the ministry were to be on a regular derivation .The Titulars had by now enjoyed seventy years possession ; they were not likely to be deprived of heritages becomingly increasinsly valuable .Typical of their attitude were the threats made to Lord Nithsdale , who in 1628 , had been given a commission to deal for a gratuitous surrender of the church lands ( Burnet History Vol. I pp34-5 ) . It has been said that " the nobles became Protestants to get the Church property , and became Covenanters to keep it " ( vide Terry op cit p 320 ) .The Decreits were certainly one of the many strands in that strong rope which pulled the Church of 1610 into shattering ruins .This factor cannot be ignored in a consideration of the failure of Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation .

Meanwhile more of the old figures of the Presbyterian party had passed from the stage .Bruce had died in 1631 ; John Forbes in 1634 ( Mccrie Life of Melville vol. 2 - p448 ) .The

Shotts' revival of 1630 was on the other hand typical of a new spirit stirring within the mass of the people .It was this same year that Struthers , an Edinburgh minister of royalist sympathies wrote to the King defining the bishops as " publici odii victimae" ( Brereton Travels Chetham Soc. p 110 ) . At this juncture it is interesting to observe Mathieson's statement : "It was not till July 1631 that the jus divinum of Episcopacy was asserted from the pulpit ; and Maxwell , one of the ministers of Edinburgh , who preached on that occasion , got so little thanks from the bishops that they warmly repudiated his doctrine , and told him it could not be proved " ( Mathieson op cit . Vol. I p 332 ; vide also Row History p 354 ) .

Charles arrived in Edinburgh on June 15 th 1633 ; three days later he was crowned in the Abbey Church of Holyrood by archbishop Spottiswoode . The form of service drawn up by Laud was obviously destined to offend the Puritan susceptibilities of the country as a whole ( Balfour Works vol. 3 p 199 and IV p 154 ) . It was in great contrast to the coronation of James .

Parliament met on June 19 th ; in its meeting we have for the first time clear indication of the admixture of spiritual and political issues which were to be forces thwarting all efforts at accommodation .It is of importance to this inquiry to note that even now the confirmation of the existing establishment was accepted . The Acts expressing the Royal Supremacy over



ecclesiastical and temporal affairs was bitterly resented by the ever growing party represented by such men as Lord Rothes ( Acta Parl Scot. Sect V pp20-21 ) .To them the Supremacy meant a forced uniformity with the Church of England .They might have inherited a Black Gown from Geneva ; they were not to be willed a surplice from Canterbury .So to men like Alexander Henderson , Minister of Leuchars and Johnson of Warriston , the freedom of the Church became a symbol of constitutional freedom ; as it has ever been men of less worthy motive might have joined the issue but the principles at stake were clear to those who had sufficient clarity of vision .The Balmerino Trial was a symptom of the unrest ( State Trials 3- pp 597-8 ; p 629 ) .Like Milton Drummond of Hawthornden in his " An Apologetical Letter " maintained " no prince , how great soever , can abolish pens " ( Masson - Drummond pp 237-41 ) .Charles , however , ever highminded and high handed had committed himself to a policy of repression .It was from this atmosphere of distrust and apprehension that Charles returned to London . On Aug. 6 th Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury ; with his elevation the High Anglican polity became a dominant factor in the situation .This polity seems to have been due to royal initiative but that he was also somewhat encouraged by a section of the episcopate might well have been

possible ( see however Mathieson vol. I p 321 ) . There was apparently some disharmony among the Scottish episcopate ( Preface c. VI Spottiswoode Hist . ) . Bishop Guthrie says of the younger bishops that they " pressed hard " concerning the adoption of a new liturgy "maintaining that there was no kind of danger in it ; whereupon Bishop Laud ( who spoke as he would have it ) , moving the King to declare it to be his will that there should be a Liturgy , his Majesty commanded the Bishops to go about the forming of it " ( Guthrie 's Memoirs p 16 ) .

Conformity to the Perth Articles had been spasmodic . Even in England one of the last acts of Abbot had been to order the parishoners of Crayford in Kent to receive the sacrament kneeling ( Regist .Abb.fol. 123 vide Biogr.Brit.) . How much more difficult it must have been to exact uniformity in the Northern Kingdom ! Accordingly the Third Book of Discipline or Canons were introduced in 1636 Charles having appended his warrant to them a year previously . The questions as to what bishops were involved in their compilation is a matter of some speculation ( Hewison p 227 op cit . ; Lawson p 485 ) .The names of Cowpar , Forbes , Maxwell , Bellenden , Sydserff and Whiteford have been suggested ; some of these were " moderates " .No moderation was , however , contemplated in the final draft as ammended by Laud and Juxon and finally approved by the King .In

his Royal Declaration authorising the Canons the King gives three reasons for them :

1. " First , that he held it exceedingly imperative that there should be some book extant to contain the rules of the ecclesiastical government , so that the clergy , as well as the laity , might have one certain rule to regulate the power of the one , and obedience and practice to the other .

2. The Acts of General Assemblies were written only and not printed , and therefore could not come to the knowledge of many ; so large and voluminous , that it was not easy to transcribe them , insomuch that few of the Presbyteries themselves could tell which of them were authenticated , which not ; so unsafe and uncertainly kept , that they knew not where to address themselves for consulting them " .

3. By Reducing those numerous Acts , and those not known unto themselves to such a paucity of Canons , published and exposed to the public view , no man could be ensnared by ignorance.

4. No one in all that kingdom did either live under the obedience of the Acts of these General Assemblies, or did know what they were or where to find them "

These reasons are obvious evidence of the prevailing liberalism .To have allowed this period of formulation to continue would have heightened the chances of a Presbyterian Episcopal accommodation .The Canons put an end to that hope ( Mathieson op cit vol. I p 321 ; Canon J.G.Simpson Scotch Episcopacy .A Precedent for Reunion .Review of the Churches Vol. V No 3 July 1928 p 337 ) .In the first place they were based on the English Canons of 1604 and totally inapplicable to the situation existing in Scotland . These at least had the sanction of the Canterbury Convocation .The Scottish Canons had no such constitutional backing ; they were not placed before the General Assembly nor before the generality of the clergy .The Episcopal committee itself seem to have been overridden by the Royal revisers .Thus the Canons became examples of the arbitrary proceedings of the King , the subservience of the bishops and the growing influence of the Laudian School .Amongst the Canons were those empowering the compulsory attendance of clergy at Diocesan Synods to be held twice a year .National Synods were to be called solely on the King's authority .A presbyter or layman who presumed to " make rules , orders,

or constitutions , in causes ecclesiastical " who " added or detracted from any rubrics , articles , or other things without the King's authority , or his successors " were " to be excommunicated " but " foreasmuch as no reformation in doctrine or discipline can be made perfect at once in any Church ,therefore it shall and may be lawful for the Church of Scotland at any time to make remonstrance to his Majesty , or to his successors , what they conceive fit to be taken into further consideration in and concerning the premises . And if the King shall therefrom declare his liking and approbation , then both clergy and laity shall yield their obedience without incurring the censure aforesaid , or any other .But it shall not be lawful for the Bishops themselves , in a National Synod or otherwise , to alter any rubric , article or canon , doctrine or disciplinary whatever under the pain above mentioned and his Majesty's further displeasure " ( Lawson pp 490- I ) .This was Royal Supremacy in excelsis ! In these Canons the " Authorised Version " of 1611 is the Bible mentioned to be used in divine service .Since the abrogation of these Canons the Church of Scotland has had no authorised version for public use .This is of interest in view of the 1947 resolution of the General Assembly to further the making of a new translation for general use .

Bishop Juxon's comment that the Book of Canons " would make more noise than all the cannons in Edinburgh Castle " was hardly justified .It was the new liturgy that caused the

explosion .The former were after all of a more academic nature ; the latter was to effect the public worship of the ordinary people.

The provision of a liturgy had been a constant claim upon the Scotch Church since Knox had produced his Book of Common Order . Even Henderson had attempted a revised Prayer Book ( Stephen vol. 2 p 240 op cit ) . James had fought shy of such an undertaking after the ill graced reception of the Perth Articles , Charles and Laud , it seems , were set on repeating the experiment of uniformity , which had proved so successful in Ireland . Stephen doubts Guthrie's assertion that the Bishops were divided over this matter also . Spottiswoode seems to have been against it ( Preface History CXI ) . Baillie writes on Jan. 29 th 1637 " I would rather think that some of our Bishops make delay , as not being at full point themselves what they would have in and what out " ( Laing Mss Vol. I p 4 ) . Since Sept 28 th 1634 when a new liturgy had been revised by Laud and approved by the King but only partly printed , there had been much rumour and apprehension . Even Baillie , the Episcopal Presbyter and scholar of no mean intelligence wrote " we must consecrate at set times with set prayers holy water to stand in the font ..... For myself I suspend judgement till I see the Book; only I fear the event to be to the hurt of our poor Church " ( ibid ) . Such apprehension would be even more imaginative among the - e lesser sort .

It is difficult to see how Spottiswoode stood

in the matter. He doubted the expediency of introducing the liturgy yet yielded to royal pressure. The revision committee seems to have included the Primate, Lindsay, Wedderburn, Guthrie, Maxwell and Whiteford. Maxwell and Wedderburn were apparently those chiefly concerned; their draft was submitted to Laud, Juxon and Wren, Bishop of Norwich. Writing to this last Spottiswoode says "I was desired to present your Lordship with one of the copies of our Scottish Liturgy, which is so framed so nigh that the English as we could, that it might be known how we are nothing different in substance from that Church. And God I beseech to keep us one and free from those that crave divisions" (Laing mss Vol. I appendix p 442). The influence of Wren upon the book might well have been considerable. He was a liturgiologist "particularly versed in the old Liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches" (Clarendon Vol. I p 153). The Scottish rite certainly bears the impress of Eastern influence as in the retention of the epiklesis.

The new liturgy was introduced by proclamation on Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> 1636 made by civil officers at the market crosses of all the principal towns. This exhibition of absolutism condemned the Book before it appeared (Burton states it was not proclaimed until July 6<sup>th</sup> 1637 vol. 6 p 146). The delay only increased the general apprehension. When eager eyes first scanned its black Gothic lettering scornful lips were quick to utter condemnation; it was the "Popish - English - Scottish - Mass - Service - Book"

( Row's History p 398 ) .On July 23 rd the first trial of the new book was made at St Giles ' .Old legends die hard but Jenny Geddes if not a person was a symbol .We have evidence that the liturgy for some time at least was used in cathedrals and parish churches . It was used at Dunblane , St Andrews and Brechin (Rothes A Relation of Proceedings vol. 4 Ban Club . ) .In the latter cathedral the Bishop officiated with pistol in one hand and Prayer Book in the other .His wife sat amongst the congregation similarly armed .

The opposition approached the divided Privy Council for redress but the Stirling Proclamation of Feb. 19 th 1638 showed the King's mind . The Prayer Book would stand .The Earl of Horne and Lord Lindsay therefore lodged a formal protest in the name of the four orders of petitioners .This was integrated , through the efforts of Henderson and Warriston into the famous Covenant of 1638 .Even now , however , the Covenant had not abjured Episcopacy : " This emphatic opinion was admittedly tentative until it was homologated by the first Assembly " ( Hewison op cit vol. 2 p 265 ) .Baillie for one had doubts about this matter ; " we have yet no assurance that any one line of the Book should be demitted , but hopes are made of withdrawing liturgy , and Canons , and Commission , and all if we would let the Bishops alone ; but the most part are peremptorily resolved not to endure any longer their lawless tyranny ( Laing Mss Baillie's Letters vol. I pp 52-54 ) .Lawson asserts : " As to



the national Covenant itself , although its object could not be misunderstood , it contains no direct denial of the royal authority and the episcopal government of the Church . This obtained first signatures from many who were opposed to violent measures , and who never contemplated the overthrow of the Episcopal Church " ( Lawson p 545 ) . Writing to Principal Strang of Glasgow who signed the Covenant " so far as that it was not prejudicial to the King's authority , the office of episcopal government itself , and that power which is given to Bishops by lawful Assemblies and Parliaments " Baillie observed " If ye saw any thing into this Covenant which , either in express terms , or by any good consequence , could infer the contradiction of any of these things ye name , ye might not in any terms , on any exposition or limitation offer to subscribe it " .He declares that he could see no word in it against the King's " full authority " , or "against the office of Bishops ".Also " Not only I believe this , but have professed so much more before the whole meeting at Edinburgh ..... Our main fear is to have our religion lost , our throats cutted , ,our poor country made an English province , to be disposed upon for ever hereafter at the will of a Bishop of Canterbury " ( Vide Lawson pp 545-6 ) .

But Spottiswoode could only say " Now all that we have been doing these thirty years past is thrown down at once ( Guthrie 's Memoirs 1758 edit . p 35 ) .

On Sept 20 th Hamilton was able to assure the Tables of the King's promise for a Free Assembly and a Free Parliament .

It would seem that the time was ripe for a fresh attempt at Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation if the situation was to be saved .

When Hamilton returned to Scotland on Aug . 10 th he was instructed to renew the Confession of Faith drawn up at the Reformation and ratified in 1567 by the Parliament .He was to maintain :

1. Bishops should be amenable to the General Assembly but this was not to interfere with **precedence** of the Bishops " that being no part of religion " but " totally in the Crown " .
2. The Perth Articles were to be held as matters indifferent .
3. The Bishops were " advised " not to attend meetings of the Privy Council " ( Lawson p 563 )

The Tables had by now , however , shown that there was every likelihood that they would press for the abolition of episcopacy .To meet the new situation Hamilton was instructed on Sept . 9 th to maintain a new accommodation :

1. " The episcopal government already established shall be limited to stand with the recognised laws of this Church and kingdom .
- 2.The Censures of the General Assembly

and the Parliament shall be inflicted on ALL subjects in a legal manner .

3. The Confession of Faith of 1580 to be solely authenticated .

4 . The Liturgy , Canons and Perth Articles to be revoked " .

( Peterkin Records p 76 ) .

This settlement was not acceptable to some of the Scottish Bishops who met Hamilton at Ferrybridge in Yorkshire .He had informed them of the instructions he carried by which the King would maintain Episcopacy but that it would be of a limited nature .The bishops would be limited in their diocesan authority. They considered this " most fatal to the Church and as in reality resigning them to the Covenanters " ( Lawson op cit p 564 ) .

Meanwhile opposition to the Covenant had been expressed in the fourteen debatable questions of the Aberdeen Doctors , John Forbes , Robert Barrone , Alexander Ross , James Sibbald , Alexander Scrogie , William Lesley and William Guild .Amongst the points at issue were : Who was to interpret the Covenant ? Should they abjure ceremonies alleged to be Popish , which they accepted as scriptural ? Was loyalty to the King limit-able ? Could they accept a Covenant which curtailed the freedom of Assembly and of parliament ? Could they , who had accepted the Perth Articles and sworn obedience to bishops ,

subscribe this Covenant without becoming perjurers ? How could they , who were believers in the lawfulness of Episcopacy and the Perth Articles , permit ministers to occupy their pulpits with the object of seducing their flocks from rites approved by the Doctors ? ( Hewison op cit 2 p 277 ) In reply the Commissioners of the Covenant maintained that the present troubles were due to the fact that innovations had been made without the sanction of the Church in its General Assembly ( ibid ) .

The King's Covenant had been meanwhile circulated . This was in effect the Confession of 1580-I countenancing diocesan episcopacy .Of the two this was the legal position but the royal move , suddenly shrewd , only had the effect of increasing the suspicions of the Tables .The Aberdeen Doctors accepted the ~~King's Covenant~~ only with the caveat that they would not condemn apostolic episcopacy or the Perth Articles and expedient ceremonies .They accepted Presbyterial Government , not as immutable , but as independent of the Pope or any foreign power .The Church alone had power to ammend the Confession . There is evidence that this position would have found support in the more moderate elements of the Tables had it been publicised .This was exactly the position of such men as Sir Thomas Hope , the Lord Advocate ( vide Peterkin Records p 92 ; Burnet p 86 ) Indeed at this juncture an accommodation might well have been found possible on these lines .

The fateful Assembly met in Glasgow Cathedral on

Nov. 21 st 1638 .Hamilton was to have a task few men would have undertaken .Henderson being elected Moderator the terms of the Bishop 's Declinature were presented.Actually its terms seem to have been revised by the King .They refused to accept the jurisdiction of the Assembly on the grounds that the bishops were debarred unless elected by the presbyteries and that the Primate was similarly prevented from being Moderator .The Assembly had " precondemned episcopal government " . The lay-elders , chosen out of every kirk-session were functionaries unknown in the Church. The ministers in the Assembly were chosen by laymen , contrary to all order , decency and custom observed in the Christian world, in no way according to the custom of that Church which they pretended to follow , the Presbyteries never associating to themselves lay elders in the elections to the General Assembly, but " only for their assistance in discipline and correction of manners , calling for them only at such times and occasions as they stood in need of their godly concurrence , declaring otherwise their meeting not necessary : - nor have lay elders sat ordinarily in Presbyteries upon any occasion these forty years and upwards , and never had any place or voice in the election of ministers for the General Assembly " ( vide Lawson op cit p578) .

As we have seen during the course of this inquiry the functions of the elders had not yet been properly defined but the office was still in being.Inspite of the assertions of the Declinature

this feature of Presbyterian polity has become an integral part of the constitution of the Episcopal Church of Scotland where the " Lay Electors " contribute in the election of a Bishop and thus indirectly to his place in the Synod . As has been frequently stated it is the doctrinal basis of the Eldership which has caused much confusion . The Church of Scotland still seems confused on this point ( vide K.D.Mackenzie The Case For Episcopacy S.P.C.K. p 120 where he argues for the possibility of the Elder possessing the de jure right to celebrate the Holy Communion ) . These points might have been settled if the accommodation could only have been allowed to take its own course .

On Dec. 8 th an Act was passed " declaring Episcopacy to have been abjured by the Confession of Faith 1580-I , and to be removed out of the Kirk " ( Act 22 ratified Aug. 30 th 1639 ) . In the words of Hume Brown " The opportunity had been lost of establishing a moderate Episcopacy , which would have embraced all ranks of the people to an extent which Presbyterianism has failed to achieve " ( History p 308 ) .

From now on civil peace was to give place to civil war ; ecclesiastical accommodation to ecclesiastical exclusion .

Of the episcopate four bishops submitted to the assembly , Graham of Orkney , Abernethy of Caithness , Fairlie of Argyll and Lindsay of Dunkeld . They seem to have continued their

ministry as ordinary parish ministers ( Lawson p 601 ) .Of the 1610 episcopate only Sydserf , Bishop of Galloway , was alive at the Restoration . He exercised his episcopal office in the Embassy Chapel at Paris and during the Commonwealth continued the succession " there being so few bishops left in England ,and consequently danger of a failure of both functions " . Like Cosin he was friendly to the Reformed Churches of the continent. Of the two young Huguenots he ordained in 1651 , one John Durel became Dean of Windsor and the other , Brevint , became Dean of Lincoln .The ministers of Paris could not understand his being excommunicated " they would admit him to the Communion ; but he communicates with the English .... I assure you he defends the Protestant religion stoutly against Papists , and none of our Scots Papists dare meddle with him after they have once assayed him " ( Graham of Rothiemay's Hist. of Scots Affairs Spalding Club Vol. 2 pp 97498 ; Apostolic Ministry p 415 ) .

It is significant that not one of the deposed episcopate ceded to Rome .

If the broad stream of events was against the possibility of an accommodation there was much pacific activity amongst individuals well meriting Arnaud's description of them as " Episcopaux pacifiques " .Of these we shall have to note John Durie ( born 1596 ) , The Aberdeen Doctors .In Ireland Archbishop Ussher was attempting much ; we should make mention

of Spottiswoode's negotiations with the Lutherans ( Baillie Letters vol. 1 p 90 , Garden Life of John Forbes pp28-9 ; Stephen vol. 2 p 247 ) .

Thus the position of the 1610 settlement if allowed to develop along its own lines might have become a Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation .Evidence of this may be inferred from the Irish Episcopate of the early seventeenth century many of whom were Scotch bishops who had been translated .The attempt was thwarted by the absolutism of James and the ultimate subservience of the episcopate .The adoption of the Perth Articles was an example of this policy .Even so it seems likely that the Church would have settled had the policy of accommodation been persisted in .The old extreme Presbyterian leaders had passed from the scene .A generation was growing up accustomed to a moderate episcopacy . Charles , however , was more ecclesiastically minded than his father .He was also out of touch with Scotch affairs and poorly served .Laud, an able exponent of his highminded and **high-handed** policy seconded his efforts in attempting an ecclesiastical conformity founded on High Anglican principles which were unacceptable to the Northern Kingdom .The Book of Canons and the Liturgy of 1637 were therefore unpopular raising the ecclesiastical issue to one of constitutional order. The unpopularity of the King's policy was enhanced by the **Decrets Arbitrati** whereby the nobles attached themselves to



the opposition .This took form in the Tables and the Covenant of 1638 .Episcopacy was finally abjured by the Glasgow Assembly of that year .The opinions of the Aberdeen doctors show that this was not unanimous but even they wished to ensure the independence of the Church .The bishops as leaders of the episcopal party seem to have made no like stand .The concessions of Charles were suspect ; the civil wars gradually extinguished all moderate elements .The sudden success of Presbyterian polity seems inexplicable unless it was that the religious and constitutional issues were indissolubly linked together .None of the deposed episcopate ceded to Rome .

It is the opinion of Dr James Cooper concerning the 1610 Settlement that " the peace it brought was disturbed by no secession , although the Church was **irritated** ere long by the arbitrary meddlesomeness and petty tyrannies of King James .The Settlement would probably have endured to the present day had it not been for the incredible rashness of King Charles I ,and the timid subservience to him of the Scottish bishops " (Plea for Reunion p 88 ) .The failure has not been a negative influence .It has been a salutary lesson to all those working for re-union that not only much patience is needed ( that is obvious enough ) but also much advertisement .The whole Body of the Church is deeply concerned ; not merely its several

members, exalted though they may be .Thus absolutism of any kind , clerical or lay , is incompatible with Christian re-union. Hence it has been realised that education in re-union is the vital need .All must learn to give assent and to take their part .To this end education in these matters has become the urgent duty of the local Church.

We may say that the great lessons learnt between 1610 -1638 were the means of inspiring the great movements which took their form from the Chicago Convention of 1886 . This led to the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 where it was resolved that re-union should be based on " The Historic Episcopate , locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church " ( vide S.C. Carpenter Church and People p 425 ) . The process of education and advertisement has been a main theme of the Student Christian Movement which in no small way has contributed to the world wide appeal of the oecumenical conferences of this century .

The great Lambeth Appeal to " All Christian People " is an oecumenical phrase made all the more splendid by the failures of the past .When in 1920 the Lambeth Conference abandoned the principle of absorption another lesson had been learnt from the 17 th century struggles in Scotland .Thus at Lausanne in 1927 it was resolved that " that these several

elements must all , under conditions which require further study , have an appropriate place in the order of the life of a re-united Church , and that each **separate** Communion , recalling the abundant blessings of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past should gladly bring to the common life of the United Church its own spiritual treasures " .The several elements were :

1. The place which the Episcopate , the Councils of Presbyters , and the Congregations of the Faithful respectively , had in the constitution of the early Church .
2. The Fact that episcopal , presbyteral and congregational systems of Government are each to-day , and have been for centuries accepted by great communions in Christendom .
3. The fact that episcopal , presbyterial and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church "

( vide Carpenter op cit . 581 ) .

These elements have been integrated in the South India Reunited Church during the course of 1947 .Indeed it seems a far cry from St Mungo's to South India but the Spirit bloweth where it listeth and who knows how and when it shall return ? In the words of M.Pannier " L'Eglise reformee est toujours

reformable " and it is by a striving after a common perfection that the best is won ( quoted Moffat The Presbyterian Churches p 171 ) . As it is we can remember the words of Dean Liddon to Stanley when he speaks " of a recovery to issue in God's good time , and with due respect to the gains achieved by the Reformation , in a reconciliation of the Churches of Christendom .As it is , the prospect is dreary ; one can only trust in Him who reigns above the storm " ( Stanley's Life vol. 2 p 169 ; Carpenter p 562 ) .The storms of the period under review were indeed hard and bitter but can we but doubt that they have been but the prelude to a brighter day ? .

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 5

### Relations with the Irish Episcopate .

It is the opinion of one the 19th century episcopalian historians that " All through the seventeenth century , Episcopacy was dogged by the baneful shadow of the King's prerogative .This is the key to the chequered history of Scottish Episcopacy , as it was the main cause of its unpopularity , and of its practical inefficiency as an Establishment down to the Revolution " ( W.Stephen History of the Scottish Church Vol. II p 207 ) .Whilst the Stuart absolutism was certainly incompatible with the freedom necessary for the establishment of a liberal settlement in ecclesiastical affairs ; it is nevertheless true that genuine attempts were made to effect an accommodation acceptable to the Presbyterian and Episcopal parties .

This can be seen from the activities of the Irish Episcopate prior to the Laudian ascendancy .One of the results of the Plantation of Ulster was the close relationship generated between the churches of Scotland and Ireland ( H.Cowan , Baird Lectures Influences of the Scottish Church in Christendom pp 88-89 ; H.A. Wilson Episcopacy pp180-3 ; J.Cooper Art. The Church of Scotland 1610-38 " The First Episcopacy " , Church Unity Papers 1911-13 Note 78 who argues that the Scotch 1610 consecrations were not the only per saltum consecrations in the history of Anglicanism for Archibald Hamilton ,minister of Paisley 1610-23 , was consecrated Bishop of Killala and Achonry

in 1623 .He was promoted Archbishop of Cashel in 1630 .The date of his ordination was three months before the Scotch consecrations in 1610 ; therefore it is most likely that he had received Presbyterian ordination only ( Pearson ~~McAdam~~ Muir , St Giles' Lectures 1882-3 pp 80-81 ) .Curiously enough the old faith predominated in Ulster ( Du Pin Ecclesiastical History of the 17 th century Book 4 chap 7 ) .The state of the reformed church in Northern Ireland resembled that of the Scotch Church during the early Knoxian period .Many parishes had no minister ; the dioceses of Derry , Raphoe and Clogher had not yet been even supplied with a Reformed Bishop .Until 1605 they were still held by prelates of the old faith ( Reid Presbyterian Church in Ireland Vol. I pp 80- 81 ) .By 1610 five of the dioceses were held by churchmen of Scottish birth ( Killen's Eccl.Hist. of Ireland vol. I pp 489-90 ) .Of these Andrew Knox , Bishop of the Isles and kinsman of the Reformer , was translated to Raphoe ( Cowan op cit p 234 ) .It is interesting to note that his successor in the Scottish see , John Leslie , was also his successor in the Irish see .He is distinguished by the fact that he still officiated as Bishop of Clogher when over one hundred years old ; and that at the age of seventy he married the Dean of Raphoe's daughter by whom he had two sons and one daughter . Both these sons became men of much note ( Wood's Athenae Oxoniensis edit Bliss vol. 4 p 846 ) .

Andrew Knox's conduct whilst Bishop of Raphoe is of some interest .Following the Plantation of Ulster a number of the presbyterian clergy made their way to Ireland ; amongst them was John Livingstone .In 1627 he was apparently " silenced " by Archbishop Spottiswoode . " Little later : " I got letters from the Viscount Clannebay to come to Ireland , in reference to a call to Killinchy , whether I went and got an unanimous call from the parish .And because it was needful I should be ordained to the ministry , and the Bishop of Down , in whose Diocese Killinchy was, being a corrupt humerous man , would require some engagement , therefore my Lord Clannebay sent some with me , and wrote to Mr Andrew Knox , Bishop of Raphoe , who when I came , and had delivered the letters from my Lord Clanneboy , and from the Earl of Wigton , and some others , that I had for that purpose brought out of Scotland , told me he knew my errand ; that I came to him because I had scruples against Episcopacy and ceremonies , according as Mr Josias Welsh and some others had done before ; and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose but to do such offices ; that if I scrupled to call him my Lord , he cared not much for it ; all he would desire of me ,because they got there but few sermons , was that I would preach at Ramullen the first Sabbath ; and that he would send for Mr William Cunningham and two or three neighbouring ministers , who after sermon should give imposition of hands .But although they performed the work he



behoved to be present ; and although he dyrst not answer it to the state , he gave me the Book of Ordination , and desired that any thing I scrupled at I should draw a line over it on the margin , and that Mr Cunningham should not read it .But I found that it had been so marked by some others before , that I ~~needed~~ not mark any thing ; so the Lord was pleased to carry that business far beyond any thing I had thought , or almost ever desired " ( Vide Life of Livingstone -Select Biographies ~~Woodrow~~ Soc. VOL, I. p.141) .

Josias Welsh , grandson of John Knox , was also ordained in the same manner .Robert Blair was ordained by his co-patriot , Robert Echlin who succeeded James Dundas in the diocese of Down and Connor in 1612 .The ordination took place in 1623 ; he was actually ordained by the Bishop who told Blair that he assisted " Mr William Cunningham and the adjacent brethren in no other relation than a presbyter " ( vide Lawson - pp 319,446-49 op . cit .; Bishop Mant - History of the Church of Ireland from the Reformation to the Revolution 1840 edit . pp456-7) .These ordinations took place in the early period of Ussher's primacy prior to the standardising policy of Wentworth and Laud .Between 1636 and 1640 , as we might expect ,

there were frequent depositions of presbyterian clergy from the parishes .

The significance of these ordinations consists in the fact that they exhibit the opinions , of some at least , of the 1610 Scotch Episcopate .Here , for a time , they were free to act along their own lines , without any pressure from an external authority .This is not to say that the " translated " episcopate had little sense of church order .On the contrary , during the Commonwealth period , they assisted in the perpetuation of the succession at a time when the Anglican bishops were unable to consecrate .The desire and the freedom , the two necessary conditions of presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation were certainly present for a brief idyllic period in the Irish Church of 1610 .It reflects also the possible trend of events in Scotland had things been peaceful .This is further verified by such statements as that of Row who comments upon the ordination of his nephew ,William Row : " the Bishop of Dunblane professed that he came there , not as a bishop , but as a member of the Presbytery , and that he would ask nothing that was not contained in the Psalm Book " ( Row's History p326;vide Mathieson op.cit. Vol. I p. 322 ) .

## CHAPTER 6

---

THE COMMONWEALTH : ITS INFLUENCE ON ATTEMPTS AT ACCOMMODATION

The events of the Commonwealth were to have a profound effect on the policy of both national churches. The subtle growth of congregationalism within the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, now so evident, may well be seen to be derived from the influence of the Independents. When Dr Clayfield was summoned to appear before the Commons for saying "From all lay-puritans, good Lord deliver me" (Lathbury History of English Episcopacy p. 155) his lament was symptomatic of the democratic ideals of an Independency destined to have a profound effect on ecclesiastical and constitutional policy (Trevelyan History of England p 401).

The attitude of the two nations towards the issues presented by the Civil War verifies the view of Hume Brown that for the English Commons "Civil liberty and not religion had thus far been the principle of their rebellion" (History p 329). It was the General Assembly who insisted on the first head of the Solemn League and Covenant which was "the further reformation of religion according to the Word of God". In this too they expressed the need for a uniformity in church polity with a similar but more exalted self interest than that of the First James. To secure a doctrinal uniformity was thus necessarily the main objective of the Westminster Assembly which was ordained by the English

Parliament to meet on July 1 st 1643 .Episcopacy had been abolished on Nov. 5 th of the same year but even now it was a common hope that some sort of unity might be achieved ( J.Macpherson The Confession of Faith p 22 ; Two Papers of Proposals p 14 ; Account of all the Proceedings etc 1661 - Papers that Passed p 11 ; J.H. Spry Christian Unity Doctrinally and Historically Considered Oxford 1817 ,Bampton Lectures 1816 p 407 ) .Indeed it was a time when " Conformist and Nonconformist were not yet formally separated , when men , trained in the study of the Fathers , yet familiar with the tendencies and principles of the Reformation , were not so rare as they now are , when the Church was still under the influence of a marvellous revival " ( Mitchell -Minutes of Assembly Intro IXXV ) . The Assembly indeed was not a sudden move ; in 1641 a committee of bishops and barons had been appointed by the Lords to consider abuses alleged against the Church . In 1642 the two houses announced their desire " speedily to have consultation with godly and learned divines " but this had been unacceptable to the King (Lathbury op cit p 149 ) .The political situation as existing in 1643 necessitated a strengthening of the bonds uniting the two countries ; that most acceptable to Scotland was a religious alliance ( Hume Brown p 329 ) .The political

causes of the Assembly are however , outside the scope of this inquiry .This expediency speedily alienated the Episcopalian and Independent parties .As Herbert Skeats observes :

" The progress of Free Christianity can be clearly traced through the period which followed , but it was far more apparent than real .The religion partially established by Parliament and the Westminster Assembly of Divines was simpler, more strict in form , and finer in essence than that which had been overthrown , but this is the best that can be said of it .Politically its establishment was expedient , for the sympathy and aid of the Scots could scarcely at that time , have been dispensed with , but religiously it was a blunder .

The Presbyterian State Church ,where , as in London and Lancashire , it enjoyed coercive power , proved to be quite as intolerant , and , to the majority of the people , less pleasant than the Episcopalian had been .Assemblies of Divines have never been celebrated for practical wisdom ,moderation , or charity , and of all Assemblies , that of Westminster , which sat for six years , and held one thousand one hundred and sixty -three sittings , showed the least of these qualities.

The imposition on the nation of the Solemn League and Covenant was a more odious infraction of religious liberty than the

imposition of the whole of the Prayer Book and Thirty- Nine Articles , for it was enforced on laymen as well as on the clergy .The Longer and Shorter Catechisms are admirable summaries of the doctrines of ultra-Calvinism , and the Confession of Faith a work of masterly theological exposition , but what is to be said of the proposed enforcement of these on a whole nation ?" ( H.S. Skeats A History of the Free Churches p 51 ) .This judgement certainly seems a strong echo of the opinion of those Episcopalians and Liberals who were so small a number to the hopeful trio ,Henderson ,Gillespie and Rutherford .These ,the ablest of the Scotch contingent which also included Baillie and Blair , had made a great impression in London by their preaching but it is doubtful if they would have been so well received in the Provinces where there was little sympathy with the Scotch Presbyterians .It has been stated that " had the bishops been willing to become the allies of a reforming parliament Presbyterianism would not have been seriously discussed " ( Osmund Airy Presbyterianism Encyclopaedia Britannica 9 th Edit. p 687 ) .Indeed , a little later , in Feb. 1644 , the Independents were quite prepared for an alliance with the Royalists to effect a restoration of Charles under conditions which involved

the keeping out of the Scotch Presbyterians ( vide Prof . S. Gardiner Camden Miscellany 1883 ) The Episcopal party were self excluded from the Assembly by their attachment to the King, and Baxter was also not present .With Archbishop Ussher and Baxter in their councils the Assembly might well have come to terms with some sort of Accommodation but political issues were rapidly engulfing the spiritual in a vortex destined to drown sweet reasonableness. The position of Baxter is typical : he was a Presbyterian with independent leanings yet " he had agreed with Archbishop Ussher in half an hour " ( Orme Life of Baxter vol. I p 92 ff ) . We must remember too that English representatives at the Assembly had nearly all conformed .In truth in making its great gifts to the Scottish treasury the Assembly had lost an unparalleled opportunity for effecting an accommodation which might have given us a truly United Church of Great Britain .The Confession ratified by the General Assembly in August 1649 became the doctrinal norm for both churches .For fifteen years , in the eyes of the law , all Britain was Presbyterian but it was a precarious legality .By the Instrument of Government of 1654 and the Humble Petition of 1657 " independency practically became the religion of England , without



the actual abolition of the presbyterian formularies recognised by the law " ( H.O.Wakeman History of the Church of England 4 th Edit p 377 ) . The tension between the English Independents and the Scotch Presbyterians was now becoming a disquieting feature of the national life . In fact " a considerable number of religious enthusiasts amongst the obscure multitude had never been converted to Presbyterianism at all . They thought the simplicity of the Gospel to be less disguised under Presbyterianism than under Anglican forms . But in reality they cared for no forms of any kind . What they valued in the religious excitement of the age was the inward stir , the stimulating emotions , the moral renewal it brought with it ; and their experience was , that such gifts of the Spirit were not confined to any forms whatever . Such men generally were the Independents and 'sectaries ' of various kinds . The Independents indeed for the most part believed that a system of Church Government had been authoritatively laid down in the New Testament , and therefore they were under strong temptation to which they succumbed in the only States where they ever constituted a majority of the population . But in the minds of the greatest Independents , such as Cromwell and Milton , theological precision on the subject of Church polity does not appear to have been strongly develop-

ed " ( J.A. Picton Oliver Cromwell p 214 -5 ) .Thus it was that Cromwell could say " in the way they ( the Scots ) now carried themselves he could as soon draw his sword against them as against any in the King's army " ( Osmund Airy ibid p 688 ) . He thus supported the toleration of the Independents and finally their supremacy which for reasons of expediency was delayed until the March 1646 .Meanwhile in January of 1645 negotiations at Uxbridge took place between the Commissioners of King and Parliament .The chief subject of these discussions was an effective settlement of the religious issue .As such it was an attempted accommodation of interest for its success would have been common to both England and Scotland .Johnson of Warriston had appeared with conditions approved by the Scotch Parliament chief of which included the acceptance of the Scotch Covenant ( Lathbury op cit p 176 ) . The King on his part offered a compromise which might well have been the basis of a satisfactory accommodation :

1. The Bishop's powers were to be limited .
2. Episcopal Government was to be assisted by a council of lower clergy .
3. Part of this Council was to consist of laymen from each diocese to be chosen by the Council of clergy .

( vide Osmund Airy ibid p 688 ff ) .

It is interesting to observe here the possible influence of Milton's great antagonist , Salmasius , who was consulted by Charles about this subject .He himself was inclined to a modified Presbyterian - Episcopacy ( Paillon Bibliotheque des Auteurs de Bourgogne I745 Dijon . Art Salmasius ) .

The proposal was unacceptable to the Parliamentary Commissioners .Following the Battle of Naseby on June 14 th 1645 Charles withdrew to appear in the Scottish Camp at Newcastle .Here he continued negotiations with the Presbyterians by corresponding with Henderson and maintained the position of Episcopacy ( Aiton Life of Henderson pp 599,606 , 664 ; Baillie vol. 2 pp 382 -7 ; Gillan 's Life of Sage pp 72-75 ) .

The rift between the Presbyterian and Independent parties was ever growing wider .In actual practice English Presbyterianism had within it those qualities of congregationalism which later led to its fusion with Independency.This difference with Scottish Presbyterianism is clearly shown by the fact that two thirds of the English classis or presbytery were necessarily laymen .

The Engagement signed on Dec. 26 th 1647 provided for establishment , by parliamentary sanction , of the Solemn League and Covenant ; with the proviso that no man should be compelled to take it against his conscience .Also to give Presbytery in England a three years trial and to establish an ecclesiastical

polity as the Westminster divines and twenty commissioners appointed by the King should agree ( Burton op cit vol. 6 p410 ) . Had this secret agreement , signed and buried in the earth , been allowed to bear fruit it is possible that an accommodation might have resulted .Indeed this may explain Leighton's assent in - g to the Engagement in 1648 when minister of Newbattle ( Pearson Life of Leighton Vol. I p 9 ; H.A. Wilson Episcopacy and Unity p 150 ; Brodie Diary Spalding Club 1863 pp 42 ; 52-57; and 59 ) .At a meeting of the Estates in 1648 this hope was modified by the attitude of Argyll and the Covenanters .As a result the Parliament broke with the General Assembly to ally themselves with the Royalists . The victory of Cromwell at Preston now gave the Remonstrants an ascendancy which naturally drew them into closer association with Cromwell .The execution of Charles on Jan. 27 th 1649 was so to strain the uneasy alliance that a few days later , on Feb. 5 th 1649 Charles II was proclaimed at Edinburgh ( Acta Parl VI Part 2 p 157 ) .

But the jus divinum of Presbyterianism was still the mainspring of that and all succeeding political activity .Thus it was that a deputation from the Estates sailed for the Hague on March 17 th to ensure the right relation of the new King to the Covenant .After some consideration Charles decided to make no definite decision but to await the fate of Montrose's expedition. Its failure meant that in Scotland was the half

open door to the English Palace .To open that door still wider Charles II became a " Covenanted King " .Henceforth the issue was clear ; Cromwell and Republican England against Charles and a Royalist Scotland .At Dunbar the God of Cromwell arose and scattered his enemies .The campaign of pacification was an unique military operation and as such hard and protracted .On Jan. 1 st 1651 Charles was crowned at Scone : " there was no anointing but Charles had once more to subscribe the Covenants " ( Hume Brown op cit p 362 ) .Charles was now face to face with Cromwell .Exactly a year from the day of Dunbar , on Sept. 3 rd 1651 ,Cromwell won supremacy at the Battle of Worcester .It was symbolic that the crown of Scotland found its hiding place under the pulpit of Dunnottar Church , symbolic indeed of a shame and a pride .

The Commonwealth had thus secured the subjugation of Scotland . It was an accomplishment denied to the most powerful kings .But also for the first time the Assembly was divided and the Assembly was Scotland at its worst or at its best .The General Assembly of July 23 rd 1653 already broken by internal dissensions between the Resolutioners and Protesters was broken up and forbidden to meet again .In this even the forces of parliament " did no bad office " ( Kirkton The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland pp40-50 -) . Whilst the protracted negotiations for a union of the two countries came to nothing they were to be a good

augury for a happier future ( Hume Brown op cit p 377 ) .By  
 supressing the Assembly the divided church was given less  
 chance of airing its divisions .These were indeed a feature  
 of the times but nevertheless localised within a few agitated  
 circles of the great .Kirkton could write " I verily believe  
 that there were more souls converted to Christ in that  
 short period of time , than in any season since the Reformation  
 though of triple its duration .Nor was there ever greater  
 purity and plenty of the means of grace than was in their  
 time " ( Hist pp 54-5 ) .As is often true in the course of  
 history the ecclesiastical is but the mirror of the secular .  
 Peace there was in the highways and byways .There were  
 taxes , there were garrisons but " there was good justice  
 done " ( Burnet History vol. I pp104-5 ) . One is bound to  
 reflect at this juncture upon Hume's opinion that no  
 denomination if left to itself will have the virtue of  
 toleration " If among Christians , the English and Dutch have  
 embraced the principles of toleration , this singularity has  
 proceeded from the steady resolution of the civil magistrate "  
 ( Essays 2 p,438 ) .

It will be just and opportune at this juncture  
 to consider the pacific work of James Durham whose  
 " Treatise concerning Scandal " was first published through

the efforts of Robert Blair in 1659 .The Glasgow Edition of 1740 published by Carstares is entitled " The Dying Man's Testament To The Church of Scotland " .Blair describes it as a " Swan-like Song " ( J.Durham The Dying Man's Testament To the Church of Scotland or a Treatise concerning Scandal .Glasgow 1740 Preface VI ) .Indeed one cannot but endorse Dr Sprott's judgement that he was " the greatest authority on schism in this or any age of the Church " (Sprott The Doctrine of Schism in the Church of Scotland Edin.MCMII p 21 ) .Again in Blair's quaint words about the work " In this our Cancer is most tenderly handled " ( Preface 1740 edit . VIII ) .

Whilst he was deeply concerned with the disputes between the Resolutioners and the Protesters his work is concerned with far greater issues than domestic concerns ( Preface op cit XXX ; G.W. Sprott op cit pp 20-21 for remarks on The Commentary on the Revelation ) .His was one of the first great works on Christian unity .Deeply versed in the history of the Early Church and in the Works of the Fathers he constantly refers to the Catholic norm ( pp264 , 274 , 300 ,313 ,318 etc ) .He maintains " it is rare to find in History that a Division hath continued long , but it hath turned to ~~separation~~ in Communion and a Schism , and again ,Schism hath not continued long , but it hath

brought forth Heresie , for divided Practices lead men to lay down such Principles as may defend them , and the Bond of Unity being broken , there is no stay or Hold , because , as that forenamed Father Basil saith , Men take on them then to speak , write , and do as they please " ( op cit p 265 ) . Thus it is necessary for Ministers , at such a Time especially, to endeavour union among themselves , and amongst the People of their Flocks " ( Scandal op cit p 193 ) . Thus they must eschew what Melanchthon termed " rabies Theologorum " ( op.cit.p. 264 ) . " Some think one Form of Government lawful , and others not that , but another.If this Difference be fairly carried ,it needth make no Division in the Church ..... We dare not , nor cannot offer any Directions for making up an Union here , save that men would unite in one Form of Government that can extend to the whole Body and that in such a Government as is allowed by Christ , otherwys it can be no Union ; because so it were not Duty , as Union is " ( op cit p 335 ) .If we should ask " What kind of Government that may be most probably , wherein men ought to unite ? " Durham answers that it must be by consensus .Thus he would reject the " Tyranny " of the Papacy ( op cit p 336 ) . " And we see in the primitive Times , even after Bishops and Patriachs were brought in into the Church , that still the supreme Government , whereby Union



was entertained did reside in a Mutual Co-ordination and Combination , even of such Bishops ,Metropolitans , Patriarchs etc acting in an united and joint way .... ".Thus in such a government there " must be in a Co-ordination and Consociation of many Church -Officers together .... " ( p 337 ) .Consequently " there is no way to peace in these Things , but to forbear ; for it is more easy to forbear some new Thing , than to make others alter what is old , except there be some Reason in the Matter to move to this " ( op cit p 334 ) . It would be interesting to speculate what influence James Durham would have brought to bear upon the succeeding accommodations had he lived longer . He died on June 25 th 1658 at the early age of thirty-six . When only twenty-eight he had been appointed Professor of Divinity at Glasgow and the same years nominated Domestic Chaplain to the King .He was in very truth the Apostle of Moderation and even by the Protesters and Resolutioners " he was equally respected " ( Preface op cit XXX ) .It is to be regretted that his work has been so long unrecognised.Even Dr G.J. Slosser in his monumental work " Christian Unity .It's History and Challenge " makes no mention of him .

Inspite of the many dissensions real progress seems to have been made in the attempt at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation.

## CHAPTER 7

---

### THE RESTORATION AND THE 1661 CONSECRATIONS

The Restoration was inevitable as soon as the death of Cromwell was announced on Sept. 3<sup>rd</sup> 1658. His son Richard could not have, had he the energy and fortitude of a Coeur de Lion, maintained the new "dynasty" against the complexities that confronted it. Charles II arrived in London on May 29<sup>th</sup> 1660 and on June 19<sup>th</sup> Edinburgh was en fete throwing off for a brief moment the puritan heaviness in an orgy of rejoicing.

The state of the pre-Restoration Church in Scotland, however, was still that of distraction and division. It was divided into two definite parties: the Protesters and the Resolutioners. The origin of these parties may be described thus; following Charles' coronation at Scone on Jan. 1<sup>st</sup> 1651, it was decided to effect the design of invading England. With the view of procuring forces for the expedition, reconciliation was made between the Royalists and the more moderate Covenanters by a resolution stating that all persons not excommunicated should be allowed to serve in the army. This new party, now called "Resolutioners" was practically the same as that formerly known as the "Engagers". This division of the Covenanters into a moderate and an extreme section continued throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The Engagers and Resolutioners were the ancestors of the Established Presbyterian Church; the

Protestors or Remonstrants of the Seceders or Dissenting churches , each of which maintained its claim to be the only Church faithful to the Crown Rights of the Redeemer and the Covenant .

The protestors and Resolutioners could find no basis for a mutual toleration .They were described by a contemporary as seeming to be " as of different religions " ( Baillie vol. 3 -pp 266-73 ; pp330-55 ). The Episcopalian leaders , had as we have seen , been driven into exile . A large number of the clergy on the other hand had come to be numbered among the Resolutioners who might well be described as the Moderates or Liberals ( Stephen op. cit . vol. 2 p 328 ) . Of these Leighton was perhaps typical ( J.N. Pearson - Life and works of Leighton p. 9 ; Brodie -Diary op. cit . pp 42-59 ). Sharp and Douglas were also representative and possibly Baillie who was of course episcopally ordained . During the Commonwealth sharp had represented the interests

of the Resolutioners at the " Court " of Cromwell while James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie represented those of the Remonstrants .Indeed , it is interesting to observe that on one occasion Cromwell is alleged to have told his brother-in-law , Wilkins , later to be Bishop of Chester , that if order was not restored between the many ecclesiastical factions he " would be compelled to set up Episcopacy in the kingdom meaning both England and Scotland " ( vide Lawson op cit . p 680 ) .Again , Wodrow states that in his first sermon after his consecration Sharpe was heard to say " I could have lived with Presbyterians all my days , but their divisions were so great that the King saw fit to set up Episcopacy , and has been pleased to name me to this See , and those that will not submit shall be forced to it by sword and law " ( Analecta Vol. 2 p 250 ) . The division of the Pre-Restoration Church was a fact which adversely affected the chances of the continuation of the Presbyterian establishment .

The policy of Charles was soon foreshadowed by the arrest of Argyll and the leading Covenanters ( Wodrow vol. II pp 63-4 ) . Argyll , who had crowned the King but a short while before was arrested on the eighth of July ; six days later other arrests took place in Edinburgh and Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston was lucky to escape his fate , for a while at least.

There can now have been no possible doubt of the ultimate purpose of Charles . If in these purposes he moved swiftly the Coven-  
 anting party , Resolutioners and Protesters , should have been  
 swifter .That they were not is the measure of their divisions .On  
 the one hand Douglas had written to Sharp on April 26 th that  
 " the generality of this upstart generation have no love to  
 Presbyteral government , but are wearied of that yoke , feeding  
 themselves with the fancy of Episcopacy or moderate Episcopacy  
 ( Wodrow History Vol. I pp 4-54 ) .On the other hand the twelve  
 Protesters under the leadership of Guthrie and Gillespie had on  
 August 23 rd 1660 published their " Supplication " in which the  
 King was exhorted to abolish popery , prelacy and to make the  
 Covenanting faction dominant in the three kingdoms ( Burnet  
 vol. I pp 121-2 ) . It was a strangely blind hope being quite  
 irreconcilable with the constitutional policy of the new monarch  
 as indeed it was to that of Cromwell .The exegesis of the King's  
 declarations in relation to the ecclesiastical settlement of  
 Scotland is a most difficult task .He was indeed the " Covenanted  
 King " and the Covenant was the oil of his anointing .Further ,  
 on Sept . 3 rd the King's letter was read to the Edinburgh  
 Presbytery in which he declared " We do resolve to protect and  
 preserve the government of the Church of Scotland as it is settled  
 by law , without violation , and to counterance in the due exer-

cise of their functions all such ministers who shall behave themselves dutifully and peaceably , as becomes men of their calling .We will also take care that the authority and acts of the General Assembly at St Andrews and Dundee , 1651 , be owned and stand in force until we shall call another General Assembly ( which we purpose to do as soon as our affairs will permit ) : and we do intend to send for Mr Robert Douglas and some other ministers , that we may speak with them in what may farther concern the affairs of the Church " ( Kirkton's History pp73-5) .

What Charles meant by the preservation of the Church " as it is settled by law , without violation " is difficult to determine ( Lawson op cit p 663 ) .The Presbytery had no qualms ; they enshrined the declaration in a silver box ( Wodrow Vol. I pp80-1 ) .

The Protesters now thought otherwise ( Kirkton p 75 ) .It is interesting to observe that the draft of the letter was apparently written on August 10 th ( vide Lawson op cit p 663 ) nearly a fortnight before the Supplication .This seems to suggest that whereas Charles and his advisers were still unsettled as to a policy the Protesters were quite clear as to the course he should take .The arrest of Argyll and the Protestant leaders in July should have indicated the course that the King would not take .

With the Restoration the old feudal supremacy of the aristocracy came once more into its own .Intercourse with the Court in England seems to have delivered them from their covenanting solemnity( Kirkton pp77-8) .When they were to take the lead it would be on the King's behalf against the Covenant This is a fact among many involved in the restoration of episcopacy .

The Earl of Middleton was appointed Royal Commissioner and on Jan. 1 st 1661 Parliament met and did not rise until July 12 th .The first act enjoined an oath of allegiance by which the King was supreme " over all persons and in all causes " .The Earl of Cassallis was the only member to protest against this as admitting the supremacy of the King in ecclesiastical affairs ( vide Acta Parl Scot. vol. 7 p 162-3 ) .This is indeed indicative of the " fallen " state of the nobility.On Feb. 1 st the " saying of mass , seminary and mass priests and trafficking papists " were to be punished according to existing laws .On Feb. 27 th the Solemn League and Covenant was abrogated and it is of importance to this inquiry that the League and Covenant was not obligatory on the subjects to " meddle or interpose by arms or any seditious way in any thing concerning the religion and government of the Churches in England and Ireland " .



This seems to suggest a genuine fear of Presbyterian domination .The retirement , at this stage of the proceedings of Lords Balmerino and Cowpar , is of some significance .On March 28 th the ~~Reecisory~~ Act was passed by which every Parliament since 1633 was declared null and void . As the Act of the Glasgow Assembly in 1638 had established the Presbyterian Church so by this summary process the old Presbyterian polity was abolished making the way clear for the re-establishment of episcopacy .By the following act " concerning religion and church government " it was declared that the royal resolution would be " to maintain the true Protestant religion as it was established within this kingdom during the reign of his royal father and grandfather " ( Lawson p 666) . Further " his Majesty will make it his care to settle and secure the same in such a frame as shall be most agreeable to the word of God , most vsuitable to monarchical government , and most complying with the public peace and quiet of the kingdom ; And in the meantime his Majesty with advice and consent aforesaid, doth allow the present administration by ( Kirk ) Sessions , presbyteries and synods , they keeping themselves within bounds , and behaving themselves as said is,

and that notwithstanding of the preceeding Acts -Recissory of all pretended Parliaments since the year 1633 " . It is further significant that the General Assembly , the bane of all the Stuarts , was not mentioned ( A cta Parl. 7 - pp 3-367 app 59-81 ) .

There was now , as so often before, an excellent opportunity to effect a Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation but it was lost .With the execution of Argyll and James Guthrie the shadows of a coming oppression began to lengthen.

The short interim before the Restoration of episcopacy was one of Synodical activity .The Synod of Aberdeen was bold enough to address the King that he would establish a new church polity " according to the Word of God and the practice of the ancient primitive Church , in such a way as might be most consistent with the royal authority and most conducive to godliness , unity , peace and order " ( Wodrow Hist vol. I pp 109-130 ) The Synods of the Covenanting West and South , however , were thoroughly alarmed with the passing of the Recissory Act ( Baillie 3 - pp 458-460 ) .Little was done by Charles to allay the mounting suspicion.His policy seemed already to be a bold attempt at a renewed absolutism.That these fears were justified is clearly shown by the events following the King's letter of Jan . 2 nd 1662 forbidding the

the meeting of all synods and kirk sessions .On Jan. 19 th the Privy Council obediently discharged them ( Sir George Mackenzie 's Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of Charles II to 1670 1821 p652 ff ) .

The establishment of the new episcopate is rightly associated with the name of James Sharp. One of the most enigmatic figures of Scottish history he was deeply involved in the ratification of the King's ecclesiastical policy . When the new episcopate was to be consecrated at Westminster Abbey on Dec. 15 th 1661 it was Sharp who was to take pre-eminence as Archbishop of St Andrews .The reason for his volte face has been assigned to various motives most of them indicating a worldliness unsuited to the character of a man of God .The late Osmund Airey has given a verdict : " It is only right , while recording a career of cold -blooded cruelty and almost unexampled political baseness , to remember that no charge that can be seriously maintained , has ever been brought against the morality of Sharp's private life " ( Osmund Airey Art James Sharp Encyclopaedia Britannica 9 th Edit . ) In the autumn of 1651 he had been " shipped " to London by General Monk .Here he seems to have shown the liberal spirit of the Resolutioners to the disadvantage of the Protesters - a fact which even then did not escape the notice of the strict Covenanters ( Lawson op cit p 679 ) . In 1658 he was again in London representing the interests of the

Resolutioners .It was then that Cromwell , who knew men , said of him " That gentleman after the Scotch way might be styled Sharp of that ilk ( Lawson p 680 ) .Baillie too describes him as " that very worthy , pious , wise and diligent young man , Mr James Sharp , the great instrument of God in crossing the evil designs of the Remonstrants " ( Stephen op cit p 331 ) . Sharp was thus closely in touch with realities .In May he was at Breda where he faithfully reported the obvious fact ,very obvious to all but the Protesters , that the Restoration would involve Episcopacy in England if not in Scotland .Thus Douglas and the Resolutioners generally,moderated their demands : it would be well if England was Episcopal but Scotland must be Presbyterian ( Wodrow Hist Vol. I pp4-54 ) .This hope demands two comments : In the first place the Presbyterians were too hopelessly divided to form a national establishment without repressive measures being exercised by one party or another ( West Leighton Remains p 159 ff ;Knox Life of Leighton p 144 - 5 ) .This seems to have been Sharp's position as outlined in his first sermon as Primate .Secondly this would have been incompatible with the King's constitutional policy which naturally enough was concerned with stabilisation .To this end episcopacy was eminently suited quite apart from more spiritual considerations( Burnet Vol. I p 142-3 ) . All this must be taken into account when we examine Sharp's part in

in the restoration of episcopacy. Cunningham says of Sharp " but history belies his epitaph , and posterity still regards him as the Judas of the Scottish Church " ( Church History of Scotland 2 nd Edit Vol. 2 p 116 ) . Burton following Burnet concludes " He laboured , as it appears to us , honestly for its establishment ( Presbytery ) at the Restoration , so long as there was any hope of its being established . He only condemned the cause when it was hopeless " ( North British Review Vol. 7 p 455 ) . Of the more modern episcopal historians we may quote Dr Luckock who says " Prima facie certainly the case is against him , and Scottish historians have for the most part failed to recognise even the possibility of his being anything less than a traitor . Looking at the whole case dispassionately , it does not appear to us that he was by any means as black as he has been painted " ( H.M.Luckock The Church in Scotland p 228 ) . The discovery of a letter dated May 21 st 1661 to Middleton , the High Commissioner , appears to suggest that inspite of Sharp's denials he was in confidential communication with Clarendon and the English Bishops concerning the restoration of episcopacy in Scotland. From this would appear, too , that he had held frequent conferences with Middleton about this very subject before leaving Scotland . It also suggests that he drew up the proclamation of June 10 th for " the disposing of minds

to acquiesce in the King's pleasure " ( Original Mss Letters of Sharp -Museum of Society of Antiquaries ,Edinburgh ; Scottish Review July 1884 and Jan. 1883 ; Lauderdale Papers, Camden Society Vols. I and II ) Whether this amounts to a betrayal of the Presbyterian cause or discreet diplomacy will always be the subject of debate for this is the key to Sharp's character. It must be remembered to Sharp's credit that he delayed the settlement of a church polity for a whole year ( Stephen op cit Vol. 2 p 342 ) . It may be true also that Douglas was offered the primacy ( Wodrow Vol. I p 228 ; Kirkton p 135 ) . Perhaps the most illuminating judgement is that of Cunningham . He was a man of some learning ; but his chief characteristic was the caution with which he formed his opinions , and the industry with which he followed them out " ( History 2 nd Edit . Vol. 2 p 88 ) . In any case Sharp had been born into the " episcopal north " . He had been baptised by the episcopal incumbent of Banff ; at Aberdeen university he had come under the influence of Forbes and Barron . In his twentieth year he had been in England escaping the turmoils of 1638 and at this period seems to have had contact with Jeremy Taylor , Saunderson and Hammond . Even as early as 1643 , on his appointment as Regent in Philosophy at St Andrews he seems to have incurred the odium of Guthrie ( Osmund Airey ibid ; Lawson p 677 ) . His place among the Resolutioners might

fairly represent a further development towards later Episcopacy.. His acceptance of the primacy is a step no one can excuse .Even this exaltation we can compare in some measure with that of Reynolds and who who would deny that the Anglican Church would have been the less comprehensive without men of this school ? Did he feel that by accepting the primacy he would be in a position to effect an accommodation ? Many would scorn the suggestion but to accept the alternative is to daub him an ambitious worldling- a judgement ill corresponding with his private character which even his enemies admit was blameless, Many have reflected upon these alternatives .Perhaps indeed he was " neither so black nor white as he has been painted " ( Stephen vol.2 p 341 ) .Caution , so typical of the Nordic peoples , can easily degenerate into duplicity.Both are akin to fear;where there is fear there must needs be repression .Perhaps this may explain something of Sharp's life and work .Perhaps too , he was not great enough for the task; in humility he should have laid the yoke on other shoulders .It is unwise to separate the primacy of Sharp from that of Adamson and Spottiswoode .The three primates represent three phases in the development of the reformed episcopate in Scotland . Adamson , the Titular , may be said to represent the experimental or formative stage .Spottiswoode and the per saltum consecrations the stage of approximat-

ion .Sharp consecrated per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus , the final stage of definition .This is of some significance to our inquiry suggesting the phases whereby the non-episcopal churches may gradually adopt the episcopate on lines similar to those of the Archbishop's 1946 Cambridge Sermon .A similar **assimilation** of the Presbyterian and Congregational polity would take place within the framework of the episcopal communions .The failure of the evolution of the episcopate on these natural lines is due , as we have tried to show , to the failure of this second assimilation .The failure , indeed , was due less to spiritual than secular expediency .The fourth phase , that of accommodation , is yet to be but there should be much hope for the lessons are writ plain .

On Dec. 15 th 1661 Sharp , Hamilton ,Fairfoul and Leighton were consecrated in Westminster Abbey by the bishops of London , Worcester ,Carlisle and Llandaff ( Burnet 1 pp 237-38 ) . As in the case of the 1610 consecrations the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were absent .Juxon , the former was old and infirm ; Frewen , the latter might possibly have been absent according to precedent .It is often asserted that Sydserf was the sole survivor of the 1610 episcopate ( Apostolic Ministry p 420 ; Cunningham 2 p 87 ) .Venables asserts there were two ( Art .Episcopacy Encyclopaedia Brit . 9 th Edit . ) .In any case we have shown how John Leslie , former bishop of the Isles,



was still Bishop of Raphoe in 1661 and in his hundreth year. Quite apart from this consideration we have seen the close connection between the Irish and Scottish Churches during the succeeding years of the 1610 episcopate when translations of Scottish bishops to Irish sees definitely took place .Apparently it did not occur to those responsible , that the succession could have been restored from this quarter .That it did not is perhaps due to the measure of royal influence from which even the Caroline divines with their " High " doctrine could not escape .The London consecrations only served the critics of the newly established Church who could say that once again it was tied to the apron strings of the English episcopate .

Sharp and Leighton were in Presbyterian orders ; the former objected to being consecrated *per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus* citing the 1610 precedent ( Brodie's Diary p 201 ; Apostolic Ministry p 420 ) . The latter also seems to have objected but eager for the promotion of a real accommodation , acquiesced ( Pearson op cit vol. 2 p 345 ) .The view he took was that " the re-ordaining of a priest ordained in another church imported no more , but that they received him into orders according to their own rules ; and did not infer the annulling the orders he had formerly received " ( vide ibid vol. I p 35 ) .Wodrow says Leighton argued " I will yield ; I am persuaded I was in orders before , and my

ministrations are valid , and what they do is only cumulative and not primitive; and though I should be ordained every year I will submit " ( Wodrow Analecta 1842 edit . vol. I p 90 ) .The work of Leighton will be discussed later in this inquiry but a consideration of his position and that of Sharp is of some importance at this juncture .In the first place the time factor was a vital one ; much had been done in a short time .From the King's point of view the Stewarts had been ill served by conferences and General Assemblies .It was unlikely also that the Scottish Church could at this time be said to be in a position to speak in an united voice .Again we may speculate as to why their scruples against re-ordination were left until the last moment .The succeeding events of Leighton's life give a clear indication of the motives for his acquiescence .As for Sharp , we can only be charitable and trust that he too was actuated by similar motives .

It cannot be denied that in this grave matter the English episcopate were anything but blameless .Their responsibility has been too lightly considered ; " Not to be hasty in laying on hands " is a warning of apostolic antiquity .

Their action further raises the question of intention.It is indeed on this point that Apostolicae Curae is found most

uncompromising where it is argued of the Anglican Ordinal "with inherent defect of form is joined the defect of intention" (Apostolicae Curae Leo XIII Sect .Catholic Doctrine of Intention) . In relation to the 1661 consecrations the matter becomes one of great importance .If it be argued that Sharp ,Leighton , Fairfoul and Hamilton are Catholic bishops can they be said to be expressing what the Church does in the immediate consecrations at Edinburgh ? One or two of the nine bishops were consecrated per saltum ( Apostolic Ministry p 420 ;Fasti vol. 5 pp 193 , 410 , Vol. 7 p 356 , 350 . 354 , 331 , 342 , 333 et seq ) .This in itself was a defect only of order but nevertheless a rejection of the very position held by the Caroline consecrators . Again , whatever truth there may be in Wodrow's account of Leighton's sentiments the broad evidence in both his and Sharp's case suggests a cumulative view of orders ( vide Kirkton Hist p149-150 for Sharp's views on the retention of the younger Presbyterian incumbents ) . It seems that they were proceeding to hand on a succession Catholic in form but purposely " accommodating " in intention .If it be said " its episcopate was derived from the new consecrations of 1661 ; there can therefore be no doubt regarding the catholicity of the modern Scottish Episcopal Church " that is not all that can be or ought to be said ( Apostolic Ministry p420 )

Truly the Catholic position of accommodation has not had its original place .The chief function of the apostolate is the preservation of unity ; each sacrament is the focus where hearts are warmed by the divine love .That this has become so dear a truth to us in this late hour is due in no small measure to those who assumed the episcopate in 1661 . Much has been said against them but let this much be said for them ; they cannot have been so blind as not to see that the path would be steep .If this be considered a subjective view we can at least adduce the evidence of Leighton's episcopate and the unhappy years of Sharp ( that these years could have been curtailed by resignation has rarely been the subject of speculation ) . The per saltum consecrations were apparently continued until 1705 when Fullerton's consecrators included two bishops , Paterson of Glasgow and Douglas of Dunblane , who had been consecrated while in Presbyterian orders ( vide Cooper Reunion p 91 for an interesting discussion on this point ) .

If to many the Ecclesia Anglicana is the Bridge Church , to Leighton and his school the Church of his Scotland occupied this honoured place . Perhaps indeed this hope still holds good .Ä Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation would be a glorious beginning , not only in Great Britain but

throughout Christendom , of an era of reconciliation .

These among many considerations can well be borne in mind upon an examination of the re-establishment of episcopacy in 1661 .

The Act of May 8 th 1662 was passed " for calling in the Bishops to the Parliament " . On May 27 th Parliament ratified the establishment in an act entitled " Act for the restitution and re-establishment of the ancient government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops " ( Acta Parl Scot vol. 7 pp 372-4 ) . On June 11 th an Act " concerning such benefices and stipends as have been possessed without presentation from lawful patrons " was passed and in effect abrogated one of the dearly won principles of the Presbyterian polity - that of election. The benefices held under the old presentations were declared ipso jure vacant . However , " every such minister who shall obtain a presentation from the lawful patron and have collation from the Bishop of the Diocese where he liveth betwixt and the 20 th September next to come , shall from thenceforth have the right to and enjoy his church benefice , manse , and glebe , as fully and freely as if he had been lawfully presented and admitted thereto at his entry , or as any other minister within the kingdom doth or may do " . If the patronage was allowed to lapse it was accorded to the bishop of the diocese " jure

devoluto " , according to former laws " ( Acta Parl Scot .vol. 7 p 376 ) . Thus every incumbent of the new establishment would be forced to accept institution from the bishop ( Cunningham vol. 2 p 93 ) .On Sept 5 th it was ordered that the Covenant was to be renounced " by all persons in public trust " ( vide Sir George Mackenzie -Memoirs p 64-5 ) .The " Act for holding of Diocesan Assemblies " was issued on Sept 10 th by the Privy Council which stated that as the Synods , Presbyteries and Kirk -Sessions have been prohibited on Jan. 9 th until authorised by the Bishop of the Diocese , the bishops were to hold their assemblies " for the exercising of the government and ordering the affairs of the Church , according to that authority which is settled and established upon them by the laws "( Acta parl vol. 7 Appendix 86-88) . These were to be held in the October .Now was the time to effect conciliatory measures .The opportunity was not taken; from this point any attempt to effect accommodation was doomed to failure .To whom can we assign the responsibility ? Once again secular influences were in the ascendent .The episcopate ,as far as we can adduce from the following evidence , except in a few instances did not assert its independence and the Presbyterian party saw little beyond the high walls of its own way .

The Diocesan Assemblies were well attended in the north but in the south and west the ministers were conspicuous by

their absence .

An examination of the Diocesan Assemblies proves an illuminating study : Bishop Wishart held his first Diocesan Assembly at Edinburgh on Oct . 14 th . Besides the fifty-eight incumbents , the Lord Advocate , the Provost and Magistrates of Edinburgh were present . Significantly the Bishop took as his text for the opening sermon " Let your moderation be known unto all men ; the Lord is at Hand " . Two ministers of each Presbytery known as the Brethren of the Conference , were appointed to prepare the agenda for the assembly . No Liturgy was to be introduced , prayer was to be extempore and the Lord's Prayer was to be used at the discretion of the minister . The Doxology was to be sung at the end of the metrical psalms , the Apostle's Creed was to be repeated at Baptism . The Scriptures were to be read publically ( The Covenanters had abandoned both the singing of psalms and the reading of the Scriptures ( Nichol's Diary p374 ff ; Lawson op cit pp 733-5 ) .

In the Synod of Moray held on Oct 21 st there were four ministers who hesitated in their answer to the question whether " the present church government " was " established by authority or not ? " Two of them finally denied this and were suspended by the Bishop . Further " In respect there was a restraint layed upon presbyteriall meetings by his Maie untill a full settling and establishing of church government my L.Bishop

declared the said restraint taken of empowering the respective presbyteries consisting of the samen brethren as formerlie to meet about the exercise of doctrine and discipline moderators of the several presbyteries being constitute ordained that ther be publick reading of the scripture befor sermon and that the Doxologie ( glorie to the Trinitie ) be sung that a confession of Faith be required from parents at the baptising of children and that the prayer after sermon be concluded with the Lord's prayer " ( Dr W. Crammond Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray Elgin 1906 p 131 ) .In the Diocese of Aberdeen twenty-four " Bretherane assessors for the privie conference " were appointed .This office of " Bretheren of the Conference " is an interesting one and no doubt could have been a helpful link with the Presbyterian polity ,As we have seen , much of the ordering of the diocese would be in their hands as responsible for the agenda of the Diocesan Synod .The minutes of the Aberdeen Synod constantly re-iterate the formula " it is enacted be the lord bishope , with consent of the bretherine of the synod ..... " Even the oath of canonical obedience is to be formally enacted with the constitutional proviso " Anent the promise and professione of canonical obedience , whereoff the tennor followis : I , A.B. , doe professe and promise that I will render to my ordinarie ,David ,



by the mercie of God , Lord Bishope of Aberdene , and his successors due ~~canonical~~ obedience , and to them to whome the government and charge is committed over me , following with a glad mynd and will ther godly adminitions : The bishope , with consent of the bretherane of the synod , ordains that evrie minister shall declare himselff anent the foresaid promise and professione of ~~canonical~~ obedience , and subscribe the same " ( Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen - Spalding Club 1846 4 pp 262-5 ) .

The Privy Council's Act enjoining immediate conformity to the new establishment by Nov. 1 st emphasised the recalcitrance of the West ; in Glasgow none of the ministers had presented themselves for institution and were thus illegally retaining their benefices . When the appointed day arrived it is estimated that nearly three hundred ministers were outed representing a third of the total number of incumbencies ( vide Milrot -Story's Church of Scotland vol. 4 p241 ; Luckock gives 350 vide p 232 History ) .Cunningham's description of the events is vivid if subjective : " In the most populous and intelligent districts of the country the churches were shut , the preaching of the gospel was suspended ; it was as if a papal interdict had once more been laid on the land .The bishops and nobles were aghast at the havoc themselves had wrought .The primate disowned the deed ; and the Commissioner

could only curse the foolish obstinacy of the men who ruined themselves for Presbytery " ( Cunningham Hist. 2 nd Edit vol. 2 p 94 ) . The time limit for conformity , however , had been extended until Feb. 1 st and when this great exodus took place it was not at the pleasure of the Primate ( Burnet vol. i p 215 ; Kirkton History p 149-50 ) . Indeed the circumstances seem to indicate the predominant influence of Middleton . The " curates " appointed to the vacated parishes were naturally of an immature type . They were mostly from the episcopal north and their origin was enough to make them unpopular amongst the people of the west and south . Their morals have been frequently called into question but this again appears to be a subjective view of what must have been a very unhappy company ( vide Stephen note vol. 2 p 352 ) . Robert Pollock in his " Tales of the Covenanters " gives a classic view of the times . Bruce , the hero of the " Persecuted Family " takes farewell of his parish-  
 oners : " You know , my dear friends what orders I have received from the bishops who possess , for the time , the civil as well as the ecclesiastical authority . I am required to acknowledge the king as supreme head of the church ; to submit to the diocesan jurisdiction of the bishops , to be re-ordained, and converted into a curate ; and to introduce the episcopal mode of worship into this church . In a word , I am to renounce presbytery ; preach , not as the Bible and my own conscience directs me , but according to the wishes of a drunken and

licentious court , and the dictates of a self -interested and domineering priesthood .And all this I am enjoined to do or leave you , my house and my living " .Again , , Mr Macduff , the curate , who had been put into Mr Bruce's place , was a Highlander, and really understood the English language , as well as the Scottish so ill . that the peasants among whom he was settled , had they been willing to hear him , would have understood little of what he said .He was a robust , huntsman -looking young fellow, as ignorant of books , and all sorts of learning , as he was indecorous in character .He hunted , fowled , drank with the officers who were stationed in the village , and , in fact , did almost every thing but what was becoming the character of a clergyman .The parishoners regarded him with horror , and fled from his presence as they would have done from a beast of prey .In no place in Scotland were the curates well attended ; but Macduff's church was entirely deserted " ( p 274- 5 ) .Although by the early 19 th century many things had been added , many forgotten , Pollock's description is a fair representation of what many thought and still think of the 1661 establishment .

Middleton's successor , the Earl of Rothes , was much under the influence of Lauderdale.The antecedents of the latter , he had been one of their representatives at the Westminster Assembly , led the Presbyterians to expect much from him .They were soon disillusioned for collation from the bishop of the

diocese had involved episcopal ordination for those in Presbyterian orders ( Lawson op cit p 736 ) .The position became one of obvious tension .Those who refused to comply left their churches and manses and glebes but not their parishes .Thus , as in England , they continued their ministry in conventicles and in the western districts the parish churches were but scantily attended . As a consequence of this the Privy Council in the August of 1663 passed " The Mile Act " which enjoined no non-conformist ministers to live within 20 miles of Edinburgh or any cathedral city or within three miles of a burgh town . The laity were ordered to attend their parish churches and non-compliance involved a landed proprietor in a fine of a quarter of his yearly rental ; a tenant a similar part of his moveables , burgesses a like fine with the forfeiture of trading rights ( Wodrow vol. I p 341 ) .

The Government now began to put into effect a policy of repression making the possibility of accommodation ever more remote .Who was responsible for this state of affairs ? Primarily the Privy Council ( Grubb Hist . vol. 3 p 222 ) . There was , it appears , only the gentle Leighton man enough among the bishops to make his protest and having had no satisfaction he offered his resignation in Oct 1665 ( Pearson op cit vol. I p 34 ) The secular powers of coercion were now used with a vengeance ever to be associated with the episcopate .Sir James Turner ,

soldier of fortune pure and simple who in his day had fought for both Covenanters and Royalists, was one of those appointed for the work. He writes in his memoirs " I stayed about two months in that country , and reduced it to an indifferent good order , by cessing on some , and by both cessing and finding many and by fair means prevailed with many so that the ministers thought if I had been permitted to have stayed longer they might have had comfort in their charges by a tolerable compliance of their parishoners " ( Sir James Turner Mss Edin. 1842 pp140-3 Ban Club Edit p 139 ; Memoirs Ban. Club edit . pp 207 , 209 ; Laud Papers vol. 2 pp 83 and 100 ) . Burnet records the fact that neither Rothes nor Sharp were pleased with Turner's often liberal , though it must be confessed , cynical attitude ( Burnet Vol. I p 379 ) .

At this juncture Sharp seems to have been determined on a policy of repression . The King seemed willing to accept the principle of toleration for the sake of the Roman Catholic minority . Lauderdale perhaps was indifferent . Sharp felt he had a superior motive and that his policy would triumph ( Mathieson Politics and Religion in Scotland vol. 2 p 210 ) . In Jan. 1664 Sharp returned to Scotland with royal warrants ; one giving him precedence over all in Scotland and making him of equal rank to the English primates , the other for the establishment of the Court of High Commission . This latter included seven bishops and four law lords . All ecclesiastical offences were to be dealt

with ; it had the power to fine or imprison without trial ( Burnet Vol. I pp 355-61 ; Wodrow vol. I pp 384 -6 ) .The " Crail Court " lasted hardly two years ; its minutes are mercifully lost but its influence lived on ( Wodrow vol. I pp 384 -95 vide Napthali pp 130-4 Appendix p 287 ) .

Whether Stephen 's comment on Sharp's action " his paltry ambition for precedence was altogether unseemly in the distracted state of the Church " is a just one it is difficult to determine .Perhaps as in the case of Adamson and Spottiswoode , he sincerely felt the need for his supremacy if the wholesale disintegration of the Church was to be avoided .Thus it was that he would say later to the Estates that " the three asserters of uncontrolled ecclesiastical supremacy were now the Pope , the King and the General Assembly of the Presbyterians " ( Lawson p 784 ; Stephen op cit vol.2 pp 362 -) .The Court of the High Commission was certainly no fit instrument for any high - minded policy .

Meanwhile repression continued ( Kirkton p 209 ; Fasti vol. 2 p 577 ; Wodrow vol. I pp 394 .422 ) . On Nov 28 th the Covenanters goaded into insurrection by the campaigns of Daziell and Turner were defeated at Rullion Green by the former .The capital saw the hanging of seventeen ;while in " the rebellious west " Glasgow ,Irvine ,Ayr and Dumfries were treated to exhibitions of sixteen hangings each ; a lesson they never

forgot ( Burton vol. 7 p 169 ) .If the Covenanters were not popular nothing could have more engendered respect than the persecutions such as these ; there were many then as now not entirely indifferent to suffering ( Laud. Papers vol. I p 265 ; . Wodrow vol. 2 p 54 note ) .Rothes called them " damm'd incorrigible phanaticks" but the traditional respect for the Covenanters has never been lost ( Laud. Papers vol. I p 254 ) . If political causes were suspected in this case such suspicion could not possibly excuse the continued coercion .The Archbishops , as far as available evidence goes , did nothing to stay the persecutions ( Row Blair p 506 , Burnet vol. I pp 404 -425 ; Sir James Turner Memoirs pp 139 -189 , cf Lawson op cit p 776 ;Laud . Papers vol. 2 Appendix Letter XXXII ) . The Covenanters at least spared Turner's life at Dumfries .One of the " phanaticks " , young Hew Mc'Kaile , could say to his fellow prisoners on the eve of his execution " eat to the full , and cherish your bodies , that we may all be a fat Christmas Pie to the Prelats " ( Napthali p 278 ) .

In 1665 , Gilbert Burnet , the young minister of Saltoun in Midlothian circulated a reproof to the bishops entitled " A Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in this Church " .Amongst other things he accused them of shewing " no zeal against vice " ; " the most eminently wicked in the country were their popular confidants " and he complained most especially about the persecutions .He was summoned before the bishops and only

Scougal's intervention prevented Sharp deposing him. Burnet, young and officious as he may have been, was a man of ability and a model parish priest after Leighton's own heart. His was probably the only parish church where the people were successfully weaned to the English Liturgy which however, "he repeated not read" ( Foxcroft Suppl p 471 ). In 1669 he became professor of divinity at Glasgow and under William III Bishop of Salisbury. His charges against the bishops have been variously valued; although he was but twenty-three at the time, youth sometimes speaks a forth-right strain no less valuable to the cause of truth than the discrete utterances of maturity ( Stephen op cit vol. 2 p 357; Lawson op cit pp 764-65; Hewison The Covenanters Vol. 2 p. 125; Kirkton's Hist. ed C.K. Sharpe pp 267-72; vide H.A. Wilson op cit p 178 ).

In the Jan. of 1667 we find Sharp bold enough to tell Rothes that in London it was being said "That you are unfit to prosecute the King's service, not at all concerning yourself in it, being dissolute, lascivious, and wholly given up to follow your pleasures" ( Kirkton edit. ed C.K. Sharpe p 261-2 ). The primate seems to have been veering round to Lauderdale, whom Sheldon had once refused to communicate ( Burnet vol. I p 313 note ). His position was getting hopelessly compromised. On July 11<sup>th</sup> 1668 whilst sitting in his coach in the High Street of Edinburgh an attempt was made on his



life by a field preacher named James Mitchell .

It is in this context that we have to consider the scheme of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation now proposed .

## **CHAPTER 8**

---

### **The Restoration Episcopate and the Revolution**

The Episcopal Church as now established had no liturgy and consequently no rites .That suspicious vestment , the surplice , was not worn .There can have been little to disturb the most ardent Covenanters among the worshippers ( Sir George Mackenzie's Works vol. 2 p 343 ; Being a Description of the Nature of that Kingdom , and what the Constitution of it is in Church and State , written by the late Reverend Mr Thomas Morer .London 1715 p 59 ) The contention was now against episcopal government , and unfortunately it must be confessed its political associations .

The Earls of Tweeddale , Kincardine , and Argyll who succeeded Rothes in the administration were determined on a more tolerant policy in ecclesiastical affairs .They also seemed to resent the political influence of the two archbishops ( Wodrow vol. 2 p 17- 59 ; Burnet vol. I pp 404 -12 ) . This is especially true of Kincardine who in 1665 had declared " a well ordered episcopacy the best of governments " and pleaded that " toleration must be given , not taken " ( Dictionary of Nat . Biog . vol. 7 Kincardine ) . Tweeddale was the ready intermediary for Gilbert Burnet and a few moderate Presbyterians , and the King in an effort to further a conciliatory policy .Accordingly on June 7 th 1669

Charles via Tweeddale , authorised the Privy Council to promulgate a Conditional Indulgence ( Burnet Hist Vol. I pp496 , 507 ; Row Blair pp 524 -4 ; Wodrow vol. 2 pp130- I ) .Sharp had been invited to London to discuss the matter of toleration with the King but he seems to have had no direct connection with the genesis of the Indulgence ( Laud . mss 2310<sup>o</sup> fol. 42 ; 2313I fol. 26 ) .Charles more than ever disposed to the Papacy had indeed strong reason for toleration ( D.Maclean The Counter Reformation p 148 ; S.Jefferson Leath Ward p 479 ; Retrospective Review XIV p 26 for Whitgrave mss relative to this matter ) .

The scheme for the Indulgence included the following enactments :

1. Ministers to be re-appointed to their former benefices if vacant or to others if they would be accepted under patronage .
2. Such ministers being orderly and receiving collation from the bishops and attending the ecclesiastical courts were to receive full emoluments .
3. Those ministers who refused collation from the bishops were to have a right to Manse and Glebe .They were allowed to exercise their ministerial office .
4. All to hold kirk-sessions and presbyteries .
5. None to administer Holy Communion or Holy Baptism to any but their own parishoners .
6. Incumbents were to discourage the resort of the

people from other parishes to their preaching .

7 . Other orderly outed ministers to be paid four hundred merks annually out of vacant parishes .

8. ~~Conventicles~~ to be supressed .

( Burnet vol. 1 pp314-6 ; Wodrow vol. 2 pp130-3 ;

Clarke and Foxcroft -A Life of Bishop Burnet Cambridge sect  
Indulgence ; Brown History of the Indulgence gives a detailed  
resumé of the conditions pertaining to the Indulgence ; Faithful  
Witness Bearing p 135 ) .

In all forty -two ministers accepted the Indulgence .

They were speedily derided by the Presbyterians as " King 's Curates"  
but numbered among them were men such as Robert Douglas ,William  
Vilant and George Hutcheson , the commentator ( D.Butler The  
Life & Letters of Robert Leighton ,London 1903 p 418 ) .

The Indulgence is significant to this inquiry as  
representing for the first time a ministry fully presbyterian  
working within an episcopal system .If the episcopate had been  
appointed on constitutional lines and a National Synod established  
there would have been every chance of a Presbyterian -Episcopal  
Accommodation .Those among the episcopate such as Ramsay ,Laurie  
and Young ; prominent laymen such as Atholl , Argyll , Murray ,  
Linlithgow and Sir William Sharp ; clergy represented by Turner,  
Cant , Robertson and Hamilton all tried to secure the establishment  
of a National Synod ( Laud . Papers vol. 3 p p 42 , 46 ,54 ;Wodrow

vol. 2 p 300 ) .Archbishops Sharp and Burnet bitterly opposed the project ; Ramsay was compelled to submit to a court of inquiry under the presidency of the Archbishop of Glasgow ( Kirkton p 348 ;Grubb Hist vol. 3 pp 250-2 ;Law Memoirs pp 70 , 84 ) .Such a synod would have been one of definition for the Church still lacked a liturgy, canons or catechism but constitutionally enacted such definitions might well have furthered a policy of accommodation .The nation as a whole was getting very weary of strife and dissension ( vide Stephen op cit vol. 2 p 378 ) . Further evidence of a genuine desire among the episcopalians to effect a better state of things can be adduced from The Reformed Bishop , a work by James Gordon , incumbent of Banchory Devenick , who advocated the establishment of a moderate episcopacy as favoured by Charles I ( Wodrow vol.3 p 232 ) . In 1680 he was deposed by Archbishop Burnet but later submitted .

The Indulgence , unpopular with the Presbyterians , was equally unpopular with the two Archbishops.,Burnet was moved in his Synod of Sept. 1669 to make a strong protest to the effect that in enacting the Indulgence the Crown had invaded the rights of the Church .At the October meeting of the Estates in Edinburgh Sharp , as we have noted , was bold enough to say that the three pretenders to ecclesiastical supremacy were Pope ,King and General Assembly . Burnet was ordered to his diocese ; Sharp was frightened when a report of his sermon found little favour at

at the Court . The King could see little difference between the episcopal and presbyterian remonstrants .

Meanwhile Kincardine had consistently advocated an accommodation by means of mutual concession but that such concessions should be established by law . The limits set by the legislature were to be rigorously applied so as to secure the immediate stabilisation of church polity ( Laud .Papers - Vol. 3 p. 17 ;Balcarres Memoirs and Leven and Melville Papers , Ban. Club ; Crawford's Officers of State pp 235 -9 ; Douglas ' Scottish Peerage edit . Wood Vol. 2 pp608-10 ; Haig and Brunton's Senators of the College of Justice pp384 -6 ) . Kincardine seems to have favoured this policy as an urgent necessity . It certainly had Leighton's support ( pearson - op. cit . p 40 ) . Lauderdale , on the other hand had his doubts about its expediency ( ibid ) .

On Nov. 10 th 1669 parliament with Lauderdale as Commissioner , passed the Assertory Act by which it was

declared " his majesty hath the supreme authority and supremacy over all persons and in all causes within this kingdom ; and that by virtue thereof , the ordering and disposal of the external government and polity of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty and his successors , as an inherent right of the crown ; and that his Majesty and successors may settle , enact , and limit such constitutions , acts , and orders concerning the administration of the external government of the Church , and the persons employed in the same , and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings and matters to be proposed and determined therein , as they in their royal wisdom shall think fit " ( Acta Parl Scot. vol. 7 p 554 ) .Tweeddale and Leighton supported the measure in the hope that it was a ratification of the Indulgence but the latter soon realised its real significance .There is evidence that the implications of the Act were not fully understood until it was in print .It was thought that the phrase " ecclesiastical matters " concerned the external and not the internal government of the Church ( Pearson op cit pp41-42 ; Lawson op cit p 786 ) .

The Act may well be described as the most typical example of Stewart absolutism ; an examination of its possible effects on the other hand appears to indicate that it was absolute to all but the King for whom it could have several



interpretations. The Covenanters described it as placing Charles as a Pope on Christ's throne ( Burnet vol. I p 513 ) .Episcopalians thought it an obvious infringement of the powers of the Episcopate , which , in part it was probably intended to be ( Laud .Papers vol. 2 p 151 ) .Lauderdale , with an eye on the Duke of York's accession seems to have looked upon it as an insurance against the possible re-establishment of Popery (Burnet vol. I p 318 ) . One of the results of the Act was the deposition, by forced resignation , of Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow ( Laud. Papers vol. 2 p 163 ) . Laudian in churchmanship he combined with it too great a degree the Scotian independence which whilst Catholic was so unacceptable to the King and Lauderdale ( Stephen op cit vol. 2 pp 364-5 ; Lawson op cit pp790-1 ) .He was certainly unpopular until this incident raised him somewhat in the eyes of the Covenanters ( Laud .Papers vol. 2 p 175 ; , Lawson op cit p 791 ) .

It seemed at first that good might come out of evil; Leighton was pressed by Lauderdale and Tweeddale to accept the vacant archbishopric .It was thought that as Metropolitan he might accomplish an accommodation .This , his constant prayer , was his motive in accepting a position from which he would otherwise gladly have retreated ( Pearson op cit p 42 ; Butler op cit . p420 ) .Before leaving for London he had a conference with Gilbert Burnet , now holding the chair of Divinity at

Glasgow , on the question of the accommodation ( Pearson op p 42 ) . The King , impressed by the urgent need for a conciliatory policy gave instructions to Lauderdale that every support should be given to the proposals ( Pearson ibid ; Burnet Vol. I pp 322-28 ) .

On his return Leighton recommended the clergy of the archiepiscopal synod " to consider themselves as the ministers of the Cross of Christ ; to bear the contempt and ill usage they met with , as a cross laid on them for the exercise of their faith and patience ; to lay aside all the appetites of revenge " ( Pearson op cit p 43 ) . Together with Burnet he perambulated his diocese exhorting the disaffected to accept the accommodation .

He was not successful ( Pearson op cit p 44 ) . Tweeddale also had meetings with the Indulged ministers but had like success ( Wodrow vol. 2 pp 178-9 ) . He declares in his letter to Lauderdale " some of that gang will not subscribe to the Lord's Prayer if asked " ( Laud. papers vol. 2 pp 205-7 ) .

On Aug. 9 th 1670 a Conference on the Accommodation was held at Holyrood . Those on the Episcopal side included Lauderdale, Leighton , Burnet , Patterson , Rothes , Tweeddale and Kincardine; Sharp kept aloof . For the Presbyterians , Hutcheson headed a party of six ministers amongst whom were Wedderburn , Ramsay , Baird , Gemmell and Burnet . Lauderdale opened the conference with

a declaration of the King's policy of reciprocal concession . Leighton followed detailing the evils of schism and the mutual alienation of the Episcopalians and Anti-Episcopalians hoping they would co-operate in washing out this stain upon Protestantism. The bishops would stoop to the lowest point of defensible condescension in meeting the Presbyterian scruples . He drew a comparison between the rival platforms ; pointing out the defects inherent in the Presbyterian , and the ground there was for concluding that Episcopacy had existed in substance , if not in name , from the infantile age of Christianity ( Pearson op cit . p 45 ) . Further " he laboured to convince them , that many parts of the Presbyterian discipline were not fortified by apostolic practice , and bare no signature of a Divine appointment ; that , in establishing a form of ecclesiastical government , we are free to institute offices of which the inspired volume furnishes no precedent , provided nothing contrary to the orders of Christ , and to the spirit of his religion , be admitted and that , by submitting to... the Episcopal form , they would not bind themselves to comply with anything repugnant to the dispensation of the Gospel , nor to tolerate any encroachment on the pastoral functions . If , however , they scrupled to allow of fixed presidents nominated by the sovereign ; or if they apprehended that along with the presidency some more exception-

able jurisdiction would accrue to the bishops - against these contingents they should be at liberty to enter a prospective protest , in as full and public a manner as they pleased .Such latitude being granted to tender consciences , he thought the sacrifices it remained for them to make only be refused by fastidious squeamishness , or vexatious obstinacy ; and he conjoined them to weigh the whole matter , as in the presence of God , without respect to party or popularity " ( Pearson op cit p 45 ) .

Mention should be made at this stage of another scheme of accommodation known as " The Instructions " , This appears to have been drawn up in London during the summer of 1670 under the influence of Tweeddale , the Earl of Shaftesbury, Sir Robert Murray and Leighton. The document containing the Instructions is dated from Whitehall July 6 th and was sanctioned by the King .The Church was to be governed by Presbyteries and Synods, the bishops were to have no authority other than that of constant moderators .All ecclesiastical power was to be derived from the King in the terms of the Assertory Act . The details of the eight instructions is prefaced by a preamble approving the practice of the Bishops for some years preceding of exercising the government and discipline of the Church in Presbyteries and Diocesan Synods in conjunction with the presbyters .The eight Instructions were as follows :

1. That the system was to continue , and that Presbyteries meet monthly , and Synods annually in May or June .

2. That every person lawfully presented to a parish church , who produced his certificates of having qualified by taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy , shall be tried and examined in the usual manner ; and if approved by the Bishop and Presbytery , due notice shall be given, and a day appointed by the said Bishop and Presbytery for the ordination and admission of the presentee , when the parishoners were to be warned to assemble , and one of the presbyters to preach , after which the people were to see their " designed minister" solemnly ordained by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop and presbyters there present, and " be exhorted to yield due reverence and obedience to him and his ministry in the same " .

3. That the rules and duties of the ministerial office were fully expressed in the form of ordination .

4 .That the bishops reside constantly in their Dioceses except on urgent occasions , and preach

every Sunday in one or other of the parish churches, when not prevented by old age , sickness , or other impediments .

5. That every minister and church -session look after the relief of the poor , and the repairing and preservation of the fabric of the parish church , as enjoined by law ; and exercise discipline towards those guilty of public scandals and gross offences , being responsible for the same to the Presbytery who in turn were to be accountable to the Bishops and Diocesan Synod .

6 . That in addition to the particular visits of the parishes within their Dioceses by the Bishops , summer visitations were to be held by the Bishops , moderators and presbyters .

7 . That a National Synod was to be called consisting of the Archbishops , Bishops , Deans , and others whenever the Crown considered such a Synod necessary.

8 . That all ministers of the Church of Scotland attend their respective Presbyteries and Diocesan Synods , and not absent themselves on any pretence whatever " ( vide Lawson op cit p 796 ) .

Apparently the Instructions were never published and the scheme , owing to the influence of Lauderdale was negated by a " Private Instruction " issued by the King ( Paterson MSS in the Episcopal Records , Aberdeen ) .

On Dec. 14 th 1670 Leighton made his great effort for accommodation at the Conference of Paisley . Assisted by Burnet and Dean Ramsay of Glasgow he met twenty-six of the Presbyterian ministry and opened the discussions with the assertion that episcopacy was the only known form of government in the primitive church " . He " further urged them to reflect , whether they would have refused communion with the church at the period of the Nicene Council ; and yet Episcopacy was then of a lordlier character than it is now affected in Scotland " . He pointed out the need for a conciliating spirit which had not been evident of the part of the main party of the Presbyterians ( Pearson op cit vol. I pp 47-8 ) . Their main contention would be over the warranty of constant presidents . If , however , the fixed presidency of bishops in the synods has no warrant then neither has that of the fixed moderating of a presbyter in Kirk Sessions and of the ruling elders ( Pearson op cit p 51 ) . The objections of the Presbyterians were voiced by Jamieson, the learned Protester . There was a distinction between Leighton's primitive episcopacy and that established in Scotland by Royal Prerogative ( vide Stephen vol. 2 p 369 op cit ) . In

primitive church the archiepiscopal office was unknown and the episcopate was parochial not diocesan .The bishops were such by popular election and were accountable for the discharge of their functions .At Leighton's request Burnet replied with the characteristic and ingenuous explanation that they too agreed only with the promotion of primitive and apostolic episcopacy . They had no wish to support other than a constitutional episcopacy ( Pearson *ibid* ; Butler *op cit* PP 443-444 ; *Analecta* III p 65; Wodrow *Hist* II pp180-181 ;Burnet *Hist* vol. I pp 527 ,528 ; Law's letter to Lady Cardross *Laud. Papers* III pp 233 -4 ) . With typical generosity ( because of the prevailing temper of the Primate ) Leighton committed to paper definite proposals which were to be remitted for further consideration ( Pearson *op cit* p 49 ) .The six propositions of Paisley mark a most definite and historic attempt at Presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation :

1. That the dissenting brethren by attending presbyteries and synods should not thereby renounce their own convictions as to Church government .
2. That all Church business should be settled in presbyteries and synods by the free votes of the presbyters.
- 3 . That in case of difference in the diocesan synod , an appeal should lie to the provincial synod .
- 4 .That entrants to the ministry should be examined by



the presbytery , and ordained by the bishop and presbyters in the parish church .

5 . That no entrant should be obliged to make any canonical oath or subscription to the bishop against his own free will.

6. That an overture should be presented to the king's commissioners to give effect to these propositions ( Butler op cit pp444-445 ; McWard op cit p 57 ff ; Stephen op cit vol. I p 369 ) .

The matter having been considered the representatives met at Edinburgh in Jan. 1671 . Hutchinson , spokesman for the Presbyterians returned what Leighton described as " a short and dry answer " . It baldly stated " We are not free in conscience to close with the propositions made by the Bishop of Dunblane , as satisfactory " ( Butler op cit p444 ; Pearson op cit p 49 ) . Pressed to give their reasons or to submit alternative proposals they declined to make any additional statement . Their sentiments were before the world ( Pearson ibid ) . The reasons for this reticence are not far to seek when we consider the context in which the conversations took place ( Hewison The Covenanters Vol. 2 p 232 ) . MacWard says that the bishop of the accommodation still suppressed the presbyter and the ruling elder it still allowed of the supremacy of the civil ruler ( Case of

of the Accommodation 1671 edit pp 12-19 ) .Leighton 's solemn  
 valediction is at once a noble rebuke and a pathetic apologia :

" My sole object has been to procure peace , and to advance the  
 interests of true religion .In Following up this object ,I have  
 made several proposals , which I am fully sensible involved great  
 diminutions of the just rights of Episcopacy .Yet since all church  
 power is intended for edification , and not for destruction ,I  
 thought that , in our present circumstances , Episcopacy might do  
 more for the prosperity of Christ's kingdom by relaxing some of its  
 rightful authority .It is not from any mistrust of the soundness of  
 our cause , that I have offered these abatements ; for I am well  
 convinced that Episcopacy has subsisted from the apostolic age of  
 the church . Perhaps I may have wronged my own order in making  
 such large concessions ; but the unerring Discerner of hearts will  
 justify my motives ; and I hope ere long to stand excused with  
 my own brethren.You have thought fit to reject our overtures , with-  
 out suggesting any healing measures in the room of our's .The  
 continuance of the divisions , through which religion languishes ,  
 must consequently lie at your door .Before God and man I wash my  
 hands of whatever evils may result from the rupture of this treaty .  
 I have done my utmost to repair the temple of the Lord ; and my  
 sorrow will not be imbittered by compunction , should a flood of  
 miseries hereafter rush in through the gap you have refused to assist

me in closing " ( Wodrow Mss Vol. XXXIV 4 th to art 15 ;Pearson op cit . p 50 ) .Leighton's own opinion appears to have been that the failure was due to the " interest and affection of continuing a divided party " ( Pearson op cit p 52 ) .

It is clear that the Presbyterian party can hardly bear all the blame for the failure of the accommodation ; suspicion and persecution are not the context for conciliation when these things are continuously evident .Parliament on July 28 th 1670 when the scheme for accommodation was still under consideration , met to pass the Act against Conventicles ( Acta Parl Scot vol VIII , 9 & 10 ) .Ministers officiating at any of the field meetings were subject to the death penalty and confiscation of goods ; the laity present were subject to ruinous fines .Other acts imposed fines and imprisonment for those having a child baptised by an " outed " minister and for absence from the parish church , without sufficient cause , for three consecutive Sundays .The lot of the Presbyterian dissenters was indeed unenviable ( vide Blackadder's Memoirs pp146-7 ) . To Leighton's protest Tweeddale answered with an assurance that the Acts were merely passed as a political expedient against constitutional dis-order .The fact remains that an informer against a field preacher was to be awarded with five hundred merks ( Burnet vol. I pp 505-7 ) .The nefarious system of fines is one of the cardinal and distinctive features of this time of persecution .It is disconcerting , to those who are

hopeful enough to trust the gentler spirit of man , that the Act against Conventicles was revived in 1746 and used against the Episcopal clergy ( Lawson p 804 ) .

Sharp , who had held aloof , took the failure to be but a verification of his pessimistic prognosis ( Laud. Pap. vol. 2 p 213 ) .Leighton stood very much alone among the episcopate ; this obvious isolation was not calculated to make his scheme acceptable to either side .

In the autumn of 1670 Leighton had hit on the novel expedient of sending six of the episcopal clergy to perambulate the West in order to explain the Accommodation .They were indeed a representative team ; Gilbert Burnet ,James Nairn , minister of Holyrood , Laurence Charteris , later Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh ,James Aird ( "Leighton's Ape " ), Patrick Cooke and Walter Paterson .Their recommendations were met by the ready arguments of the Presbyterian peasantry .These were further assisted , " As soon as we were gone a set of these hot preachers went round all the places where we had been , to defeat all the good we could hope to do " .Burnet continues " we who were engaged on it had lost all our own side by offering it , and the Presbyterians would not make one step towards us " ( Burnet vol. I p 524 ; Row Blair p 468 ; Butler op cit pp437-8 ) .

The Second Indulgence of 1672 promulgated by the Council of Sept. 3 rd at the instigation of the ubiquitous Burnet was another

attempt to give effect to a policy of conciliation .The dissenters were to be placed in parishes by couples where full power to exercise their ministry was granted to them .The scheme was supported by Leighton who compared it to " gathering into the chimney ,where they might burn safely , the coals that were scattered over the house and setting it all on fire " ( Pearson op cit vol. I p55 ; Wodrow vol. 2 pp203 -10 ) . One hundred and twenty ministers were so appointed . The scheme included the following points :

- 1.The indulged ministers should share the stipends .
2. Pastoral duty to be confined to parishoners .
3. Preaching to be confined to churches .
4. Simultaneous communions to be held in each diocese .
- 5 .Indulged ministers should not leave their parishes without a licence from the bishop .
- 6 . Dues to be paid to , and discipline be taken up by ,Presbyters as before .
- 7 . Ministers outed since 1661 were to attend their parish churches and be certified by the magistrates .
- 8 . Recusant ministers were to be reported and apprehended ( Hist of Indulgence pp179-181 ) .

The English Indulgence of 1672 gave little satisfaction to the harassed Presbyterians except to renew a hope that perhaps royal support for the Episcopal establishment was weakening. To Leighton the Indulgence was "a forlorn hope" (Hewison op cit . vol. 2 p 238 ). Once again those who accepted it were ostracised as being disloyal to the Covenant ; rebellion against Lauderdale's enforcement now became rife ( Wodrow vol. 2 pp217 & 227 ). Leighton felt that his efforts were doomed to failure ; writing to Lauderdale he states " For us of this order (episcopal) in this kingdom I believe 'twere little damage either to Church or State , possibly some advantage to both , if we should all retire ( Laud. Papers vol. 2 p 238 ) . His last effort to secure peace by means of a National Synod was spurned by Lauderdale as being too reminiscent of 1638 . Leighton resigned office in Dec. 1675 and retired to Horsted Keyes , Sussex in whose parish church he was buried ten years later . He was in truth the Apostle of Accommodation .

Sharp and Lauderdale now dominated the ecclesiastical scene and Burnet's re-appointment to the see of Glasgow strengthened their hand in the furtherance of a " firm " policy . All was not well within the establishment itself . Bishop Ramsay , Leighton's successor at Dunblane , could protest to the Primate " Do you think that I am turned fanatic because a Bishop ? " ( Lawson

op,cit p 823 ) .This acute tension within the episcopate was due to Ramsay's advocacy of a National Synod and a convocation of the whole clergy ( Wodrow vol. 2 pp315 , 342 ; Laud .Pap. vol. 2 p64; Grub Hist vol. 3 p 250 -2 ; Lawson p 824 ;Stephen op,cit vol,2 p 379 ) .Such constitutional action would have done much to alleviate the deplorable state of the Church .Ramsay and his supporters -s , however , did draw from the King a more " favourable " interpretation of the Assertory Act ( Lawson op cit pp824-5 ) .

The pages of the succeeding years are deeply stained with red .The murder of Archbishop Sharp on May 3 rd 1679 ; the " bloody " Claverhouse who led

" The human bloodhounds of the earth,  
To hunt the peasant from the earth " .

Bothwell Bridge ; these are but a few acts , men and places which any student of accommodation would gladly pass over quickly but which cannot be ignored .

In 1679 James Gordon , the minister of Banchory - Devenick , published ~~anonymously~~ " The Reformed Bishop " in which he advocated a constitutional episcopate very much on the lines now prevailing within the constitution of the Scottish Episcopal Church as we know it to-day .He seems to have been no friend to the accommodation suggesting it was a mistaken policy to convert a Presbyterian Moderator into a " Presbyterian Bishop " who would be episcopal only in name ( Grub vol. 3 pp274 note

Wodrow vol. 3 p 240 ) He also advocated the revival of liturgical worship . What results attended his suggestions have been already noted .

Before Charles had died on Feb. 6 th 1685 Rothes ,Lauderdale and the "Laudian " Burnet had also passed from the unhappy scene.

The accession of James was a precarious proceeding to all but the Scotch episcopate and those few Anglicans , who with them held the theory of divine right to be a fact of dogma .

There was , on the other hand , a brighter side to the picture .Bishop Sage could say " We possessed the true Christian faith - the same faith which the Catholic Church possessed in the days of the first four General Councils .We have neither subtracted one article from it nor added one article to it . We owned only two Christian sacraments , and these two we had administered in as great purity , and as exactly according to our Lord's institution , as you ( the Presbyterians ) or any party on earth can pretend to. We were sure that we had governors who had our Lord's commission to rule us , to dispense the word to us , and to admit us to duly consecrated sacraments .In a word , we had Bishops canonically and validly ordained by those who had power to ordain them ,and communicate the true episcopal power .Our worship could not be



charged with any thing idolatrous or superstitious ,immoral or unchristian, in it .Set forms we had but few , and these few used in all other Christian Churches .No Church on earth has , no Church ever had , less of pomp and gaudiness , or more of plainness and simplicity ,Our excess , if we had any , lay not that way " ( The Reasonableness of a Toleration to Those of the Episcopal Persuasion inquired into purely on Church Principles , in Four Letters to Mr George Meldrum ,Professor of Theology in the College of Edinburgh 1704 pp71-73 ) .In very truth the Episcopal Establishment of this period was remarkable .It could be justly regarded , as the party of the Accommodation contended , as a Bridge Church .

In the same way as Knox and Melville had been raised up to lead the parties of reform so William Carstares was a man mete for his time and generation ( Stephen op cit vol. 2 p420 -I ) .In exile his contacts with William of Orange had proved of advantage to the Presbyterian cause and the new king had come willing to suspect the allegiance of the Scottish episcopate ( M'Cormick Life of Carstares p 39 ff ) . Even as late as Nov. 3 rd 1688 all but two of the Scottish Bishops could write to the odious James as " the darling of Heaven so miraculously prospered with glory and victory " ( Wodrow vol.IV p 468 ) .The Test Act of 1681 had provided that

all who held public office should subscribe to the Protestant religion as defined in the Confession of 1567 and that the King was supreme in all causes ecclesiastical and civil .Bishop Scougal , although old and infirm , led the opposition to this high-water absolutism ; even after Bishop Paterson's explanation that they would not admit of any supremacy over the spiritual affairs of the Church , eighty clergy resigned rather than take the test ( Acta Parl. Scot. VII pp243 -4 ;Burnet vol. 2 pp 301-4 ; Methieson Politics and Religion in Scotland vol. II p 295 ) .Prof. Cooper asserts " It was because they had taken this oath - and not for any reason they had to be grateful to King James , or any sympathy with his Popish projects , that all the Scottish bishoprics refused at the Revolution to acknowledge William and Mary ; they would have owned the Prince of Orange as Regent , but they could not , in the face of this oath ( which they had pressed upon the clergy ) take him as King , they would have been disgraced for ever had they done so " ( James Cooper op cit p 94 ) . That William's suspicions were confirmed by later events Dr Cooper willingly admits " But the adherents of the deprived bishops were , in those early years , mostly adherents also of the exiled Stuarts , and though among those who joined in the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745 there were many Presbyterians , yet the established Church as a whole was Hanov<sup>e</sup>rian , and the Episcopal Church as a whole was Jacobite " ( op cit p98-99 ) .

Thus it was that when Bishop Rose of Edinburgh waited on William it was , with little or no help from the English bishops , that he found the monarch 's ear ( Keith Catalogue of Bishops vol. II pp65-72 ) .William himself was for moderation ; no doubt a Presbyterian - episcopal accommodation would have been a solution most acceptable to his practical mind but the attachments of the Scottish episcopate obviously made this impossible ( Cook History of the Ch. of Scotland vol. 3 pp440 ff ; Acts of the Assembly 1843 edit. p 222 ) . In 1689 the Convention of Edinburgh passed the renowned declaration " That Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters is , and hath been , a great and unsupportable grievance of the generality of the people , held since the Reformation ( they having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters ) and therefore ought to be abolished " ( Somers Tract vol. 2 p 389 ) .At a meeting of the Estates held on July 2 nd 1689 the Earl, of Annandale introduced an " Act for the Abolishing of Prelacy " and a clause agreed upon after much deliberation stated thatv " the king and queen were to settle the government of the Church in the way most agreeable to the inclinations of the people " ( Acta Parl IX pp 98-104 ; Leven and Melville Papers pp137-ff ) .

Meanwhile John Gordon of Banchory- Devenick and John Barclay , Minister of Cruden , as commissioners of the Aberdeen Diocesan Synod had petitioned the Estates for the calling of a National Assembly wherein a new policy for the Church would be determined.It is doubtful if this would have produced a genuine accommodation -

The episcopal church was disestablished on July 22<sup>nd</sup> 1689 ( Acta Parl Scot IX p 93 ) . For nine months the country was without any settled church polity ;for a short space of time presbyterian and episcopal clergy worked on in their ministry regardless of each other ( Leven and Melville Papers vol. 2 Instructions of the King to His Council July 1689 ) .The acts of 1690 saw the genesis of the present Scottish establishment ( Acta Parl Scot IX p 10( ;IX Appendix 38 ,IX III Act 2 , IX ,pp 117 -31 .IX pp III ff ; VII p 554 & IX p 133 ) By Whitsunday 1690 all episcopal incumbents were ordered to quit their benefices .A number of the older men continued in office inspite of this .The statute of July 19<sup>th</sup> conferring patronage on the heritors and elders , subject to the congregation's appeal to the presbytery effectively severed the Episcopalians ( and for the first time in the various changes and chances ) from the Presbyterian establishment ( Acta Parl. Scot . IX pp106 ff ;Wodrow Analecta vol. I pp 275-9) .This fact should be borne in mind in relation to arguments as to whether the new establishment was generally acceptable or not .

The first General Assembly for thirty-seven years met in Edinburgh on Oct 16<sup>th</sup> 1690 .Unity between the Protester and Resolutioner factions was only preserved by the need of furthering the new establishment .The King's policy for comprehen-

sion including the episcopalians was met with no little opposition ( Innes Law of Creeds p 77 ) .The ministers from the episcopal north were , just as in similar circumstances many years ago , conspicuous by their absence .

The Oath of Assurance passed by the Parliament of April 1 st 1690 imposed upon the Presbyterian and Episcopal clergy a requirement that they and all persons holding civil office should admit William as king de jure and de facto .The Episcopalians were in the main prepared to swear simple allegiance but not to subscribe to the King's legal title .The Presbyterians felt that the new Act made their ministry conditional upon a civil subscription .They had too no scruple as to the oath of simple allegiance de jure ( Acta Parl . vol 3 pp 385 ff ) .A period of tension ensued ; if the few words of Bishop Rose cost the episcopalians the establishment , the few interceding words of Carstares won for the presbyterians their present honoured place ( McCormick Life of Carstares pp 57- 61 ) .The north ,as before , was equal to the Assembly who sent commissioners to Aberdeen that those among the episcopalians still within the establishment should subscribe to the Westminster Confession and the acceptance of the Presbyterian government of the church .The redoubtable James Gordon protested to the Commissioners that the Assembly in no wise represented the national church ( Misc Spalding Club .vol

2 pp163-171 ;Preface vol. I pp LXXXV fff). There was some justification ; in 1707 there were still 165 episcopal incumbents within the establishment .Through migration and death this number was gradually reduced ( Burton op cit vol. 7 p465 ) .By the time Queen Anne ascended the throne the episcopal church was composed of the bishops and non-juring clergy , who refused the oaths ; those still in possession of their parishes and recognised by the presbyteries but not admitted to the courts ; those who defiant to the last , maintained their parishes ( vide Stephen op cit vol 2 p 453 ) . As the establishment grew stronger , the episcopal church weakened by wounds within and without was fit only for the shadows of the shade .A new reign of law , the rise of an era of commercial prosperity , opened the minds of men to other things than bigotry and persecutions ( although indeed these as ever continued in some form or other ) .When the problem of presbyterian -episcopal accommodation is again to emerge the horizons have widened still more ; no longer is it a matter of the unity of a national church - it is of a much more glorious concern .

Why did the episcopal establishment of the Restoration fail ? Stephen , the episcopal historian asserts " There is a sense in which it may be truly said that this Establishment of Presbytery in 1690 was the work of the Scottish bishops "(Vol.

2 p 417 ) . In a large measure this inquiry warrants this . The failure , however , was cumulative ; the seeds of its unpopularity had been sown before the Restoration time . Bound too closely to regal absolutism of which it seemed a spiritual counterpart , it had become a system associated too much with earthly kingdoms , too little with heavenly . Instead of becoming a symbol of unity , the episcopate became the sign for constant dissension . Whatever this inquiry may lead us to , it cannot but lead to the conclusion that episcopacy can only be the hallowed means of unity if it is primitive and constitutional . In the long struggle with Presbyterianism this fact especially emerges . Whatever may be adduced from the relative proportion of episcopalians and presbyterians in 1690 ; whether the Presbyterian establishment was as ~~Byzantine~~ as the Episcopal - the fact remains that for Scotland her Church has become a hallowed expression of the national life . It has not happened by chance .

But a new time is here ; a still more hallowed expression is needed . There is a supreme Calvinism which declares that history is not purposeless ; in a very real sense the history of Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation is the unfolding of man's discovery of the supreme message of the Christian gospel which is the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man . The Church must be the living exposition of this truth . If

the episcopate can rightly represent the former ; presbyterianism can represent the latter .

We now terminate our inquiry of national attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .For the next two centuries contributions to the solution of this problem are made by many individuals who have adorned the Scottish scene until finally with the oecumenical movement it becomes a matter of supra-national interest .



We may conclude that this period under review is one of intense activity in the matter of Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation which cannot be accurately understood apart from its historical background .The events of the Commonwealth were to have a profound effect on the polity of the two national churches .Had Archbishop Ussher and Baxter been members of the Westminster Assembly there might have been a prospect of accommodation but as it was the Assembly abolished episcopacy .The ascendancy of Independency in England had its effect on the Scottish Church .The Presbyterians divided by the Resolutioner and Protester faction were frustrated and prospects of accommodation were bleak .With the Restoration episcopacy was re-established .Of the new episcopate Archbishop Sharp , as Primate , from the first unpopular , was assisted by colleagues ill equipped for the delicate task committed to them .Efforts at reconciliation were initiated , in the main , by Robert Leighton ably assisted by Gilbert Burnet ,The repressions of the Government encouraged Covenanting recusancy .Too closely allied with Stewart absolutism the episcopal church became unpopular with the presbyterian masses especially in the West .The campaigns of Turner and Claverhouse were hardly calculated to diminish such an attitude . The murder of the Primate made the condition of the Church a

matter of obvious concern but nothing was done to alleviate the situation after the resignation of Archbishop Leighton . The presbyterian party became more and more resolute in their attitude against episcopacy .With the Revolution of 1688 William would have preferred a Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation ; this might have been possible had the Scotch episcopate not associated themselves too closely , by oath and sentiment , with the Stuart dynasty .The only alternative was a Presbyterian establishment which was ably furthered by William Carstares .Remarkable for his sagacious statesmanship, he was an able successor to Knox and Melville , being typical of that genius for individual leadership so often produced by the Presbyterian system but denied to the Episcopal .Whether or not the new establishment was representative of the national will , the fact remains that it has become a hallowed expression of the national life .With distractions and divisions obvious in the present world -wide scene , no national expression of Christianity can be truly representative unless it is supra-national .Hence the new activity in the problem of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation expressed through the oecumenical movement .It is towards the schemes of accommodation produced in this latter age that the student of modern attempts at unity will naturally turn .

The attempts at accommodation effected in England , had of necessity , some bearing on the problem in the Northern Kingdom . In March 1689 the King was able to exert his influence on the Commons so that the Oath of Allegiance was modified to secure the admittance to Parliament of all Protestant subjects .This step was followed by a Bill of Comprehension " for uniting their Majesties ' Protestant subjects " .There were two main proposals :

1. Ministers would only be required to state they would submit to the existing constitution of the Church of England .
- 2 . Institution to a benefice would not require reordination but only the imposition of hands of a bishop ( Historical Papers submitted to the Christian Unity Association of Scotland 1911-13 p 122 ) .

Curiously enough the Lords and the Bishops passed the measure ( it was by means yet a " King's Bench " ) ; it was rejected by the Commons .Burnet explains this by asserting that some thought the prospects of a continued toleration would be imperilled if the number of nonconformists was reduced " a curious forecast of the argument sometimes heard in our day ,

that a reunion of the churches would make the Church too strong " ( Dr Mac Ewen op cit p122 ) . Philip Henry , Baxter and the saintly Howe together with most of the Presbyterians favoured the scheme , the Baptists and the Independents opposed it , mainly owing to Erastian fears . Following the unfavourable reception of the Commons a Commission was appointed to give the matter further consideration . Tillotson , then Dean of St Paul's , exercised a dominating influence on the discussion . His own accommodation prepared before the Commission began its deliberations included the following points :

1. The Liturgy to be revised . Ceremonies enjoined by the Liturgy or Canons to be made optional .
2. A new body of Canons to be prepared dealing specially with the reformation of manners both in ministers and people .
3. The power of excommunication to be taken from lay officials and entrusted to the Bishops.
- 4 . It should be sufficient for a clergyman to promise generally to accept the doctrine , discipline and worship of the Church of England . Re-ordination should not be required of men ordained in the Continental Reformed Churches .
- 5 . As to Englishmen , preference should in future be given only to those who were ordained by Bishops ,

yet men already ordained by Presbyters should not be compelled to renounce their ordination , for such persons it should be enough to receive imposition of hands in some such form as this :

" If thou art not already ordained ,I ordain thee "  
( Birch Life of Tillotson pp182-4 ) .

The " High-Flying party " headed by Jean ,Dean of Gloucester , withdrew from the Commission leaving Tillotson and the conciliatory party to persevere in their policy of accommodation. The resolutions of these twenty members included :

1. Lessons from the Apocrypha should be omitted from the Prayer Book .
2. Kneeling at Communion should be optional .
3. The sign of the Cross to be used less frequently.
- 4 . The Athanasian Creed to be used less frequently and a note explaining the damnatory clause to be added .
- 5 . Various alterations in the Liturgy with a view to accommodating Nonconformists e.g. the substitution of " minister " for "priest " and deletion of phrases ascribing powers of absolution to the ministers ( Christian Unity Papers p 124 ; J.W.Hunkin Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation pp 50 - 51 ) .

Burnet , now Bishop of Salisbury , took some prominent part in the discussions on re-ordination .He maintained that while there was ground to challenge Roman Catholic Orders the Church of England had recognised the Reformed Ministeries of the continental churches as in the case of Preb. Du Moulin of Canterbury and cited the Scottish *per saltum* consecrations . This was opposed but the Commission ,with two dissentients , accepted the " hypothetical Formula " advocated by Tillotson and the Liberals whereby those ordained by presbyters would receive episcopal imposition of hands without any statement of the validity or invalidity of previous orders ; the " ordainer " and the " ordinand " reserved their opinions .The matter , naturally enough soon became one of general concern ; polemical activity increased .Pamphlets , such as that of Sherlock , characterised the Conservative school while the replies of Tenison, later Archbishop , represented the Liberal view .Events in Scotland with the establishment of Presbyterianism lent colour to the lurid predictions of the Conservatives that an attempt would be made to Presbyterianise the Church of England .This view gained ground .William sent his message to Convocation that " his good intentions would not be disappointed " .When Jean was elected prolocutor of the Lower House it was obvious that Convocation would not accede to a policy of accommodation .In the words of Jean " *Nolumus leges Anglia Mutari* " ( Kennet vol.

III p 562 ) .The contemporary pamphlet Vox Cleri further illustrates the stiffening attitude:" must we give offence to loyal Churchmen in fear of offending some few dissenters ? Is it necessary that a parent should yield to a disobedient child on his own unreasonable terms ? " Convocation was adjourned until Dec. 4 th when the King repeated his message .The Lower House , however , had set its course against that of the King. It has been pointed out by Prof. Mac Ewen : " One feature of the discussions seems to deserve special attention .The essential invalidity of the Orders of the Nonconformists was not asserted with much concord or clearness " ( Church Unity Papers p127 ) . Calamy observes that the accommodation would " have brought in two thirds of the Dissenters " ( Abridgement vol. I p448 ) . Stoughton maintains that although the Presbyterians were " disposed to return to the establishment they did not represent the views of the other nonconformists " ( Stoughton Religion in England vol. 5 p 105 ;Hunkin op cit p51 ) .The victory of the Conservative element ( not necessarily Laudian apologists) is one which requires careful analysis for there were other issues , besides those essentially doctrinal involved ( Church Unity Papers p 126 ; J.Stoughton op cit Vol. 3 p 476 ; vide William Sherlock's Vindication of some Protestant Principles of Church Unity and Catholic Communion 1688 ) .It may not be out of place here to quote M. le Moyne " one of the ordinary preachers

to the Reformed congregation at Roan " who justified the retention of episcopacy by the English on grounds of national character " I believe not that any Nation in the World hath more need of Bishops than the English .For they have a natural fierceness and withall a natural inclination to superstition ..... And there is no nation less fit to be governed by a popular administration, because all the English have too much courage for that , are too unquiet and jealous , and all think themselves born to reign," ( vide Durel - A View of the Government and Publick Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas 1662 ) .

It was unlikely that events in Scotland would be uninfluenced by this decision of the Lower House .The rejected scheme did not see the light of day again until reprinted in 1854 .

William of Orange , holding no brief for those who maintained a divine right for any specific mode of church government ,was nevertheless obviously concerned for the absolute establishment of the Protestant cause ( Burnet op cit p 538 ) . Convocation had given little encouragement to the English Presbyterians who were not the least of the general body of the Nonconformists .Thus Carstares in his " Hints for the King " argues " That as it was impossible for his Majesty to show that favour to the Nonconformists in England who were a numerous body ,and at the same time zealously attached to Revolution Principles ,



which he was naturally disposed to do because such conduct would awaken the jealousy of the Church of England , here was an opportunity of effectually demonstrating to them that the discouragements they might labour under during his administration were not owing to any prejudice he entertained against them , but to the necessity of the times and to the delicate situation in which he was placed " ( Carstares StatePapers p39). This argument of the " Cardinal " is one , which quite apart from other important considerations , the Bishop could not successfully oppose .Perhaps insufficient attention has been paid to it .

Nevertheless a pacific settlement was vital to the King's policy . His attempts at comprehension were ably seconded by the leading statesmen of Scotland .Amongst the many lay schemes of accommodation is that of Lord Tarbet .Proceeding on the lines of " concurrent endowment " he suggested :

1. All ministers excluded from their parishes for public differences should be restored to their parishes unless objected to by the heritors , in which case they were to be provided for in some other way.
2. Both Presbyterians and Episcopalians should meet in Presbyteries and Synods of their own , the Episcopalians having power to elect permanent moder-

ators , and the Presbyterians to have power to change their moderators .The constant moderators were to be paid provided there were not more than one for each Diocese at the rate of £1000 Scots south of the Tay and £800 Scots north of the Tay .

3. Both parties were to be allowed to hold General Assemblies , but only by permission of the King .

4 . Neither party was to interfere with the discipline exercised by the other .Both were enjoined not to preach against the model of the other, and to entertain towards one another Christian Charity and communion " ( Leven and Melville Papers p 125 ; Church Unity Papers pp 101-112 ) .

Previous to the Convention's Act of July 21 st 1689 , which ensured the passing of the Episcopal establishment , the redoubtable James Gordon of Banchory-Devenick and James Barclay , Minister at Crowden petitioned the Parliament .It is stated they had " received a commission from the Parliament for a free and full General Assembly " .The petition contains the assertion " So they are earnestly desirous of a union with all their Protestant brethren who differ only from them in methods of Church Government , not doubting but that if both sides would mutually lay aside their unchrist-

ian heat and animosity they might be reconciled as to  
 serve their Lord with one mind and to tolerate one  
 another in the things in which they may still differ"  
 ( Church Unity Papers p 10' ) . This liberal manifesto  
 although in favour with the Duke of Hamilton , the  
 High Commissioner , was out of favour with the  
 Commons . Thus as in England the " Commons saved the  
 Church " ( Manifesto mss Archives -Scottish Episcopal  
 College , Edinburgh ) .In any case the proposals  
 were probably impracticable for the Aberdeen  
 ministers did not seem to desire an Assembly which  
 included lay elders ; on the other hand the strict  
 Presbyterians would countenance no revocation of the  
 Settlement ( Hill Burton vol. 7 p 428 ;Leven and  
 Melville Papers pp91 & 136 ; Miscellany of the  
 Spalding Club vol. 2 p 163 ) . By 1695 it was clear  
 that the King's hopes of accommodation had been  
 dashed .The Act of that year allowed Episcopal clergy  
 to remain beneficed without subscribing to the  
 formula of the 1694 Assembly .Dr Weir has commented  
 " It is to be observed that in the formula there is  
 nothing to prevent a minister who did not believe in  
 the NECESSITY of Episcopacy serving a cure " ( Church  
 Unity Papers p 116 ) .Indeed this might well still

apply to those clerks in Episcopal Orders who maintain liberal views .

In 1701 there were apparently 814 parish ministers of whom 235 were Episcopal incumbents ( ibid p117 ) .Dr Weir further comments " In what sense they were Episcopal , except in refusing to own the Presbyterian Church government , is not clear .It does not appear that they owned allegiance to the deprived Bishops ( ibid p 117 ; Napiers Memoirs of Dundee vol. 3 p 601 for reference to the " invisable Kirk " etc ) .

It is interesting to note that most episcopal of parishes ,Saltoun , retained its episcopal incumbent until 1744 ( Dr Carlyle Autobiography p 93 ) .Besides these there were those like the deprived minister of Cavers , who lived at Hawick " where he performed clerical duty in his own lodgings ,being attended by such as adhered to Episcopacy and the interest of King James , among whom were a few gentlemen of the most ancient families in the country .... he had no objection for the Presbyterian form of church government , but having taken the oath of allegiance to King James he could not conscientiously transfer his allegiance to King William " ( vide Dr John Somerville My Own Life and Times ) There were some like Dr John Cockburn , the deprived minister of Ormiston , who moved south to become incumbents of English parishes ( vide Dr John Cockburn -The Historical Relation of the

late General Assembly Edin. 1691 ) Many of the sons of the deprived ministers became ministers of the new Establishment ( vide Fasti ) .

By the beginning of the 18 th century a quarter of the incumbencies were held by episcopal ministers .Thus for a period ranging over almost half a century the present establishment contained within it clergy episcopally ordained .The King's policy had certainly borne more fruit in the barren north than in the south .

As we have noted the problem of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation became now one of individual concern .

## **CHAPTER 9**

---

### **SOME INDIVIDUAL ATTEMPTS AT EFFECTING A PACIFIC SETTLEMENT IN THE PROBLEMS OF PRESBYTERIAN - EPISCOPAL ACCOMMODATION .**

## John Dury

---

John Dury was born at Edinburgh in 1596 and educated for the ministry at Sedan under his cousin Andrew Melville. He seems to have been at Oxford in 1624 ( D .MacMillan The Aberdeen Doctors p 293 ) . In 1628 he was appointed pastor of an English Presbyterian congregation formed by the merchants of Elbing , Prussia .

In the judgement of the great historian of Christian Unity he is " one of the most unique figures in the whole drama of Church Unity to date " ( G.J.Slosser Christian Unity p. 58 ) . Indeed his subsequent history amply verifies this judgement. He seems to have been Presbyterian , Anglican or Independent with characteristic indifference. Presbyterian pastor at Elbing , when he returned to England in 1634 he was ordained priest with a licence of non-residence. He was also appointed a Royal Chaplain and preferred to a Lincolnshire benefice . In 1642 he resigned his chaplaincy to Mary of Orange at the Hague and became minister to the Merchant Adventurers at Rotterdam . During the Commonwealth he seems to have willingly adopted Independency; his work for unity received the support of Cromwell ( MacMillan op cit . pp295-6; Karl Brauer - Die Unionstaitigkeit John Duries unter dem protektoratCromwells - Marburg 1907 ) .

While in Prussia he was invited by Dr Godemann , a Privy Councillor and civil magistrate of Gustavus Adolphus , to assist in an effort to promote unity between the Reformed Churches ( G. Westin Negotiations about Church Unity 1628-34 Upsala 1933 pp 187-91 ) .

He had some connection with affairs in Scotland for he held conversations with members of the University of Aberdeen ( The Doctors ) , the General Assembly , the Ministers of Edinburgh and with the Scots Commissioners in England ( M.Tabaraud .De la Reunion des Communions Chretiennes , Correspondences qui ont eu lieu , des Projets et des Plans , qui ont été formes a ce sujet , depuis la naissance du protestantisme jusqu' a present .Adrien Le Clere Paris 1808 pp 301 -4 ; Prof. G.H.Turnbull Hartlib,Dury and Comenius -Lond. 1948 p 216 ) ,

The pioneer of the oecumenical method he suggested three ways " to heal the present distempers " :

- I. Let all parties who take the Holy Scriptures for their Rule of Faith and Practice set forth the fundamentals in matter of Doctrine and Practice , or that wherein they profess full agreement .
2. Let men declare their disagreements , these to be followed by the ways or means of reconciliation set down by the more moderate ones of all parties .



3. Let the same parties declare both positively and negatively the rules by which they are willing to walk inoffensively toward those with whom they disagree ; and , in case of offence , how the same ought to be taken away by mutual consent . ( A Summarie Account of Mr John Dury's Former and Latter Negotiations for the procuring of true Gospell peace , with Christian Moderation and Charitable Unity amongst the Protestant Churches and Academies . London 1657 - Author Unknown ; vide also Slosser op. cit . p. 59 ) .

While the work of Dury had no direct effect on the problem of Presbyterian - Episcopal Accommodation in Scotland it is significant insomuch as that the Scottish Church , was inspite of domestic preoccupations , in touch with what we could term the first stirrings of the oecumenical movement ( G.H. Turnbull - op. cit . pp213 , 216, 223 , 320 ) .

Towards the end of his life , with little prospect of accomplishing his great design , Dury could only say " The only fruit which I have reaped by all my toils is that I see the miserable condition of Christianity, and that I have no other comfort than the testimony of my conscience " ( MacMillan op. cit . p 296 ) .

John Davenant (1572-1641), a predecessor of Burnet in the see of Salisbury, was amongst those in the Establishment who were of like mind to Dury. He did not consider the differences between Episcopacy and the presbyterians as presenting any particular difficulty to re-union (Glosser op. cit. p. 60; Davenant contributed to Dury's *Eirenicon, de pace ecclesiastica inter evangelicos* - 1634 which was referred to by Bishop Hall in his "Peacemaker" as the "Golden Tractate"; Ollard - Art. "Re-Union" in Dictionary of English Church History, Ollard and Crosse - London 1912). Bishop Davenant's great work "praelectiones de Justitia habituali et actuali" published in 1633 is one of the finest expositions of the Reformation Doctrine of Justification (William Cunningham - Discussions on Church Principles - Edin. 1863 p.25). Firmly rooted in the Reformation principles he, like Dury, advocated unity on the simplest possible basis. He would have advocated the acceptance of the Apostle's Creed as a sufficient basis with the possible addition of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer (Macmillan op. cit. p. 296). As one of the Anglican representatives at the Synod of Dort he was

in close touch with Dury's circle and in these wider concerns of the Church of England enjoyed the limited confidence of Laud ( G.H. Trunbull - op. cit . p. 221 ; Hunkin - Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation p. 35 ). In one his great appeals for unity he doubted " not at all , but that the Saxon and Helvetian churches , and others which either consent with these or those , acknowledge themselves to have , and to desire to retain, brotherly communion with the English , Scottish , Irish and other foreign reformed churches. Surely , as concerning us , although we consent not with them in all points and titles of controversial divinity , yet we acknowledge them brethren in Christ , and protest ourselves to have a brotherly and holy communion with them " ( J. Davenant -Exhortation to Brotherly Communion betwixt the protestant Churches p. 33 1614 Edition , London . ) This view is typical of that party so well represented by Dury on the continent and by its author at home ( Norman Sykes -The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries London 1948 pp23-33 ; vide also C. Silvester Horne {A Popular History of the Free Churches 2nd Edit May 1903 Lond. p 100 } . Such a

reasonableness was indeed in the spirit of accommodation.

### JOHN FORBES

John Forbes was born on May 2 nd 1593 , the second son of Bishop Patrick Forbes and his wife Lucretia who was the daughter of David Spens of Wormiston .Bishop Patrick Forbes consecrated to the see of Aberdeen died on March 28 th 1635 after an episcopate unequalled in its apostolic witness throughout the entire annals of the Church in Scotland .

John Forbes was educated principally at Aberdeen University and Sedan .In 1619 he was ordained by a Dutch presbytery and thus we have the curious paradox that the most eminent apologist of Scottish episcopacy was never episcopally ordained ( E.G. Selwyn The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes p 26 ) .In 1620 he returned to Aberdeen where he was appointed Professor of Divinity in King's College . Here the northern galaxy of divines had gathered forming a group known to posterity as " The Aberdeen Doctors " .They included Dr Alexander Scroggie, Dr William Leslie , Dr Robert Baron , Dr Sibbald and Dr Rees .Their learning and zeal for a constitutional episcopacy , a zeal rooted and grounded upon their unrivalled knowledge of the Schoolmen , made them lights indeed in their generation ( Dr Macmillan - The Aberdeen Doctors ) . Besides his university work Forbes held various charges in the City .

The Irenicum was published in 1629 to support the Episcopal party in the controversy that followed the Perth Articles of 1618 .

After the abolition of episcopacy by the Glasgow Assembly in 1638 pressure was exerted upon Forbes and his confreres .They refused the Covenant and the brilliant coterie was dispersed (Gordon's Scotch Affairs vol. III pp 226 -47 ; vide also G.D. Henderson - Religious Life in Seventeenth -Century Scotland Cambridge 1937 pp 58-59 ) . Bearing the bitter blow with resignation he retired to the ancestral estate at Corse intending to lead a life of studious quiet .In the August of 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was made obligatory .To this he refused to submit and on April 5 th 1644 sought refuge in the Netherlands ( Dr Low John Forbes of Corse and his Eucharistic Teaching pp26-27 ) .In exile he produced his Instructiones Historico -Theologicae .He returned to Scotland in 1646 and died at Corse on April 29 th 1648 .His wife, Soete Roosboon , was Dutch the marriage having taken place at the time of his ordination ( vide Dr Sprott's Art. -John Forbes in the Dictionary of National Biography where it is stated that he was ordained at Middleburg ) .

Forbes , in the Irenicum maintained that episcopacy was not so much the " esse " as the " melius esse " of the Church (Irenicum II XI Prop. 13 pt I ) .The influence of the church polity extant in Scotland , Holland and Germany was not a negative one as far as John Forbes was concerned . He strove to establish the continuity of Protestantism " with historical

Christianity from primitive times " ( Henderson op cit p 137 ,see also pp 127-129 ) . In defence of his own orders and the like he appeals especially to the Scholastics such as St Thomas and St Bonaventura who regarded the priesthood as the fundamental order of the Church .In the matter of ordination there was a distinction between " aptitude " and " execution " ,between Order and Jurisdiction ." Every priest by virtue of his own ordination had the ' aptitude ' for transmitting Orders to another ; but the exercise or ' execution ' of this power was stayed by the law of the Church which confined it to the bishops only .This was a matter of Jurisdiction .By ' divine law ' Jurisdiction lay with the college of the presbyters ; which had come under apostolic sanction to function through its moderator or bishop , and through him alone . None the less the ' aptitude ' for transmitting Orders was still there ; and when a bishop fell into heresy and an orthodox successor could not be found , his authority reverted to the ' college ' from which it was really derived " ( Selwyn op cit p 19 ) .It is further pointed out that the Scholastic exaltation of the priesthood was not so much derived from St Jerome as " in the fact that the priest said Mass ; if he could do that he could surely celebrate the lesser sacrament of Ordination .But should we not state the case even more broadly , and say that Christian instinct refuses to allow the separation of the ministry of Jurisdiction from the ministry of Grace ? In other words , an identical cause underly-

ing the scholastic doctrine of Order and the Presbyterian claims of the Scottish Reformation . What the ministry of the sacraments was to the Schoolmen , the ministry of the Word was to the sixteenth century Scot ; namely , the instrument of their experience of God " ( Selwyn op cit p 22 ) .

The doctrine of episcopacy as propounded by Forbes in the Second Book of the Irenicum depends mainly on four propositions :

1. Disparity in the ministry is consonant with the picture of the Church as given in the New Testament .
- 2 . The unit of authority is the college of presbyters which possess territorial jurisdiction over the area served by their ministry .
- 3 . Each such college should be presided over by a permanent moderator or bishop , whose rule must be constitutional i.e. exercised with the consent of his co-presbyters .
- 4 . An orthodox Church without bishops labours under an ' economic ' or administrative defect ; but does not thereby cease to be a Church : though episcopacy is to be desired and striven for .

( F.C. Beles " The Teaching of the Aberdeen Doctors on Ordination " Historical Papers submitted to the Christian Unity Association of Scotland 1911-13 ; Selwyn op cit p 18 ; Irenicum II-XI - Prop 13 pt I ) .



As with Ussher ,John Forbes sees in the exaltation of the collegium presbyterii a principle of Catholic Order which the Presbyterian polity , had to a certain extent , vindicated. Indeed we have evidence that the Irenicum attracted the notice of Ussher and there is a letter from him to Forbes dated 1632 in which he expresses his appreciation and congratulates Scotland on producing " a new Irenaeus " ( vide Selwyn op cit p 32 ) .It would seem that in some measure the Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation associated with Ussher owed not a little to what Forbes called " the middle party" of Scotland ( Irenicum 1636 edition I- IX - 4 ) .

In a real sense Forbes was the Hooker of the Scottish Church although they differed in their views upon episcopacy . To the latter episcopacy was de jure (divino) at its inception but not necessarily invariable .The bishop was superior to the presbyter both of Order and Jurisdiction ( Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity Book V p 189 Paget ; vide Selwyn ,op cit p 36 ) Forbes ' view was essentially indigenous in its interpretation and probably by design rather than by accident he never once acknowledges Hooker in his works.

# ARCHBISHOP USSHER

---

James Ussher was born in Dublin on Jan. 4<sup>th</sup> 1580 .His family derived their ancestry from the Nevilles who accompanied John Plantagenet to Ireland .In 1593 he matriculated at Trinity College in his native city .The charter of the infant university had been obtained by his uncle ,Henry Ussher ,Archbishop of Armagh .Graduating M.A. in 1600 he became fellow of Trinity .At the age of nineteen he accepted the challenge of Henry Fitzsimons , a Jesuit then imprisoned in Dublin , to a discussion on Bellarmine's defence of the papal position . While still a layman he was appointed proctor and catechetical lecturer of the university .Although under the canonical age he was ordained to the diaconate and priesthood in 1601 by his uncle the Archbishop of Armagh .Five years later he was appointed the Regius Professor of his university and chancellor of St Patrick's Cathedral ( vide Elrington's & Todd's Life vol. I Dublin 1847 ) . It is significant that Walter Travers , an English Presbyterian , who had been inhibited by Whitgift in 1586 , became subsequently Provost of Trinity College .Travers had been inhibited for " disliking the way of ordination by bishops according to the English book ";he had gone over to Antwerp , and was there made minister by some elders and ministers .... in a private congregation , after the form of Geneva ( Strype - Whitgift 1822 edn. vol. I p 477 ) .When

applying to the archbishop to be made Master of the Temple Whitgift replied that he was " either in no degree of the ministry at all , or else ordered beyond seas , not according to the form in this Church of England used " ( ibid p 341 ) .Two of the Fellows under whom Ussher received his early training , Fullerton and Hamilton , were Scottish Presbyterians ( Killen vol. I p 453 ) . There is no definite evidence of any separate congregation of Presbyterians being formed in Dublin at this time and this fact is highly significant .In 1615 Ussher took part in an attempt to impose a Calvinistic Confession , embodying the Lambeth Articles of 1595 , upon the Irish Church .This brought him into contact with James and was naturally a time of some stress and apprehension .By 1619 , however , he was able to visit the King with many testimonials as to his orthodoxy . Indeed so impressed was James that he was nominated to the vacant see of Meath and consecrated in 1620 .Four years later he succeeded his uncle as Archbishop of Armagh .His part in defending the Irish Church against the extraneous influences of the Church of England is particularly notable .He took a leading part in the Convocation of 1634 which drafted the canons of the Church of Ireland and defeated the attempts of Bramhall , then Primate , to make the Irish Church conform exactly to the doctrinal standards of the sister church . His motive appears to be the maintenance of the Calvinistic element which had

been introduced in 1615 . Whilst visiting Oxford for the purposes of research the 1641 rebellion broke out and this prevented his return to Ireland .He remained an exile from his native country for the rest of his life .He was appointed to the temporalities of the See of Carlisle in 1642 but never seems to have resided in his diocese .When the Westminster Assembly was convened he was offered a seat on its council but declined and in 1646 retired to Wales .

His last effort at accommodation was made , at the request of Charles when he assisted in the Isle of Wight negotiations with the Parliamentary party . During the Commonwealth period he appears as one of the few bishops enjoying the respect and sympathy of Cromwell .

His prodigious labour in the field of Church History has never been fully appreciated overshadowed , as it has been , in the popular mind by the scheme of biblical chronology suggested in the Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti ( Elrington and Todd -Life Vols I & XVII ) .

His early contacts with Fullerton and Hamilton are of some significance as they provide links with the Church of Scotland ( vide Pearson M'Adam Muir -St Giles ' Lectures - 3 rd Series 1883 Scottish Divines -Samuel Rutherford pp80-81 ) .Indeed Ussher's influence was strong enough to impress itself on the Edinburgh ministers .It is

related that his suffragan , William Bedall of Kilmore (1629-41 ) ruled his diocese with such popular good-will that the Edinburgh ministers said of him " What have we done ? If the King will give us such bishops as this , we will beg them on our knees and receive him with all our hearts " ( T.W. Jones - A True Account of the Life and Death of William Bedall . Camden Society pp 164 - 9 ) . This statement was apparently made during a conference with the Edinburgh clergy ( ibid ) . It is the opinion of the Bishop of Chelmsford that Leighton's Accommodation was based on Ussher's " Reduction " ( H.A. Wilson op cit p 177 vide also D.Butler op cit p 321 ) .

Indeed the influence of Ussher was not confined to his native Ireland or to England .

The accommodation associated with Ussher was first proposed in definite form a year after he had left his native country in 1640 .

In the preface to his scheme Ussher maintains that the Presbyters of the Church of England are charged at their ordination not only to minister the doctrine and the sacraments but also " the discipline of Christ " . From the works of the Fathers , especially Ignatius , he is able to prove that in the primitive Church the Presbyters " had a hand not only in the delivery of the doctrine and sacraments , but also in the

administration of the discipline of Christ " .Again , " For with the Bishop the rest of the dispensers of the word and sacraments joined in the common government of the Church ; and therefore , where in matters of ecclesiastical judicature Cornelius , Bishop of Rome , used the received form of ' gathering together the presbytery ' , of what persons that did consist , Cyprian sufficiently declareth when he wished him to read his letters ' to the flourishing clergy which did preside or rule with him ' ; the presence of the clergy being thought to be so requisite in matters of episcopal audience that in the fourth Council of Carthage it was concluded ' that the Bishop might hear no man's cause without presence of the clergy ' ; which we also find to be inscribed unto the Canons of Egbert ( Excerptio Egberti ) in the Saxon times , and afterwards unto the body of Canon Law itself ( 15 qu. 7 cap. ; nullus ) . True it is that in our Church this kind of Presbyterial government hath been long disused , yet seeing it still professeth that every pastor has a right to rule the Church ( from whence the name of Rector was given unto him ) and to administer the discipline of Christ , as well as to dispense the doctrine and sacraments , and the restraint of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this realm ; no man can doubt but by another law of this realm this hindrance may well be removed " . Thus Ussher entitles his scheme " How

the Church might be synodically governed , Archbishops and Bishops being retained " .

The accommodation suggested four main points :

#### I. The Weekly Parish Meeting

This was to be comprised of the Incumbent Pastor , Churchwardens and Sidesmen .They were to make report on the scandalous of the congregation and to administer admonitions and reproofs ." If these can be by no means be reclaimed , they may be presented at the next monthly Synod , and in the mean time be debarr'd by the Pastor from access unto the Lord's Table " .

#### 2 . The Rural Deanery

This was to become a miniature Diocese with a monthly Synod : " Whereas by a Statute in the 26 th of Henry VIII ( revived in the first of Elizabeth ) Suffragans are appointed to be erected in 26 several places of the Kingdom , the number of them might well be confirmed unto the several Rural Deaneries , into which every Diocese is sub-divided ; which being done , the Suffragan ( supplying the place of those which in the ancient Church were called Chorepiscopi) might every month assemble a Synod of all Rectors and Incumbent Pastors , within the Precinct and according to the major part of their voices , conclude all matters which were brought into debate before them ".Imp-

enitent persons presented from the parish meeting , if still impenitent , should by this Synod be excommunicated

### 3 . Diocesan Synods

The Diocesan Synod might be held once or twice a year and discuss matters of great moment .This would consist of " all Suffragans , and the rest of the Rectors and Incumbent Pastors , or a certain select number of every deanery within the diocese , with whose consent , or the major part of them , all things might be concluded by the Bishop or Superintendent , call him whether you will ( Bishop or Superintendent "ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΝΤΕΣ id est, superintendentes ; unde et nomen episcopi tractum est " Hieron ep. 85 ad Evagrium ) ; or in his absence , by one of the Suffragans , whom he shall depute in his stead to be moderator of that assembly " .

### 4 . The Provincial Synod and National Council .

The Provincial Synod is to consist of " all the Bishops and Suffragans , and such other of the clergy as should be elected out of every Diocese within the province ;and the Archbishop of either province might be moderator of this meeting , or in his room some one of the Bishops appointed by him .This Synod might be held every third year ; and if the Parliament do then sit , according to



the rule of the triennial parliament , both the Archbishops and provincial Synods of the land might join together and make up a National Council wherein appeals from inferior Synods might be received , all their acts examined and all ecclesiastical constitutions which concern the State of the whole nation established ( Elrington XII pp 527-36 ) .

The scheme was favourably received by a sub-committee of divines appointed by the House of Lords . It was also again suggested at the Carisbroke Conference in 1648 ( Carr Life and Times of Ussher p 329 ) . Both the King and the Presbyterians were prepared to accept it . The Parliamentary Commissioners , however , could broach no compromise with episcopacy .

At the Restoration the Presbyterians were again prepared to accept what was substantially Ussher's scheme . They were prepared " to allow the true primitive presidency in the Church , with a due mixture of Presbyters ; that this scheme was necessary to avoid the corruptions , partiality and tyranny incident to the administration of a single person " . They pointed out the danger following upon " the great extent of the bishop's diocese " . The Presbyterians further suggested " that the suffragans should be chosen by their respective synods ; that districts be reduced to a moderate extent ; that the bishops may not govern at discretion , but be restrained by the

the direction of canons or constitutions " ( Collier Ecclesiastical History VIII p 386 -93 ) .

The triumphant Bishops rejected the proposals :  
 " the Presbyterian objections against a single person's administration in the Church were equally applicable to the State . The extent of the dioceses they conceive well enough fitted to the Bishop's inspection and management " ( ibid VII p 393 ) .

In the October of 1660 Charles II offered the Presbyterians terms again based on Ussher's accommodation : " Because the dioceses , especially some of them , are thought to be of too large extent we will appoint such a number of suffragan bishops in every diocese as shall be sufficient ..... No bishop should ordain or exercise any part of his spiritual jurisdiction without advice and assistance of his presbyters .No bishops should exercise any arbitrary power " ( Collier ibid VIII p 395 ff ) . The Bill of the King's Declaration was defeated on the second reading by 183 votes to 157 .Had those 26 votes been cast otherwise we should have had , in all probability , a truly United Church of Great Britain .

F.R. Bolton has suggested the influence of Bucer and Knox upon Ussher's formulation .In the De Regno Christi Bucer had advocated the restoration of the old Rural Bishops or Chorepiscopi , one to every twenty parishes ( F.R. Bolton-Archbishop Ussher's Scheme of Church Government - Theology Vol

L no 319 pp 9-16 ) . It would seem also that Ussher was in some measure influenced by the later developments of Knox's policy . The accommodation had , on the other hand , little place for " the great Counsell of the Church " . This was the genius of the First Book of Discipline and the glory of the Scottish polity .

## ROBERT LEIGHTON

Robert Leighton, the chief apostle of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation was born probably in Edinburgh although Burnet assigns this honour to London. He was the eldest son of Dr Alexander Leighton who at one time was professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh. This strict presbyterian, as author of "Zion's Plea against the Prelacie" became notorious for his suffering during the Laudian ascendancy. Robert Leighton entered Edinburgh University in 1627 graduating four years later. The next ten years he spent in travel and seems to have been much influenced by his stay at Douai. This contact with the Church of Rome was to have a profound effect upon him. "Having learnt from these better portions of that corrupt establishment, that its constitutions were not altogether dross he went on to discover that the frame of his own church was not entirely gold" (Pearson Leighton's Works vol. I p 8). During this period, 1631-41, he was certainly influenced by the Port-Royalists and the Jansenists. (D. Butler The Life and Letters of Robert Leighton London 1903 p 89-III). He was ordained Minister of Newbattle in 1641 at the age of thirty. Here he spent eleven years in quiet pastoral industry but it was hardly a peaceful time as far as his relations with his fellow ministers was concerned (Fasti vol. I p294). This period is characterised by one famous incident: in the Synod he was

publically reprimanded for not " preaching up the times " .  
 " Who " , he asked , " does preach up the times ? " .It was  
 answered that all the brethren did it . " Then , he rejoined , "If  
 all of you preach up the times , you may surely allow one  
 poor brother to preach up Christ Jesus and eternity " ( Pearson  
 op cit . p 9 ) . His assent to the Engagement in 1648 is  
 probably further evidence of his " too lenient " opinions which  
 were obviously of ill accord with the narrow temper of the  
 times .In 1653 he was appointed Principal of Edinburgh Univer-  
 sity and Primarius Professor of Divinity .Here he exercised  
 considerable influence and seems to have eschewed the thorny  
 paths of dogmatic theology to become rather the exponent of  
 " experimental divinity " ( Bower's History of the University of  
 Edinburgh vol. I pp 261-3 ff ) .

With the Restoration Charles II resolved that  
 Leighton should be one of the new episcopate and his acceptance  
 of the proposal has been the subject of much speculation (Burnet  
 vol.I p 242-9 ;Butler op cit . p 330 ff ) . It seems , however ,  
 that the Episcopacy he contemplated was that associated with  
 Ussher and with which Baxter and many of his party would have  
 been in agreement ( Ancram & Lothian Correspondence II -p455 ;  
 Pearson vol. I p 22 ; Life of Robert Blair p 362 ; West -  
 Leighton's Remains pp 159 ff ; Bishop Knox - Life of Leighton p

I44-5 ) . The whole tenor of his later life seems to verify this assumption .His fellow nominees ,Sharp , Fairfowl ,Hamilton and Alexander Burnet were clearly of different mould .On the question of re-ordination , previous to his consecration , Leighton disagreed with Sharp , the future primate , who had scruples about the matter having quoted the *per saltum* precedent of 1610 .Leighton 's view was that " the re-ordaining of a priest ordained in another church imported no more , but that they received him into orders according to their own rules ; and did not infer the annulling the orders he had formerly received " ( Pearson op cit p 25 ) .It has been pointed out that the Restoration consecrators did not share this view ( *ibid* ) .Thus he regarded the second ordination as " cumulative " and not " privative " ( *Analecta* vol. I p 90 ) .

As Bishop of Dunblane Leighton strove hard to effect a policy of conciliation but with so little success that he tendered his resignation in October 1665 ( Butler op cit p 374 ; Row's Blair pp 426-27 ) . In reporting to the King he complained of the violent measures used against the Presbyterians : " he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion itself in such a manner , much less a form of government " ( Burnet vol. I p 388 ) . The King persuaded him against resigning by a promise of a moderate policy .It was not until the summer of 1667 , after the suppression of the Pentland Rising,

that the moderate party were in any position to influence events and conciliation made slow progress .Thinking he could hasten it by his acceptance , he was in 1670 appointed to the see of Glasgow , lately vacated through the forced resignation of Burnet ( Butler op cit . p 433 ff ) .The period between 1667 and his resignation in 1674 seems to mark the period of most intensive activity in the matter of accommodation .After his resignation from the second see , a step he took with the knowledge that the policy of accommodation had failed , he retired to the South of England and died in London on June 25 th 1684 .He was buried in the church of Horsted Keynes , Sussex , his few mourners being the simple villagers amongst whom he had spent the last years of his life ( Pearson op cit p 81 ff ) .

For an examination of Leighton's contribution to the work of accommodation it is necessary to refer to a short work " A Modest Defence of Moderate Episcopacy , as established in Scotland at the Restoration of King Charles II " ( Given in Pearson's -Leighton's Works vol. 2 p 646 ff ) .He asserts , " Episcopal government , managed in conjunction with presbyters , presbyteries , and synods , is not contrary to the rule of Scripture , or the example of the primitive Church , but most agreeable to both " .Leighton then argues that episcopacy had been acceptable to the Presbyterians in England as shown in

"Two Papers of Proposals to His Majesty , by the reverend ministers of the Presbyterian persuasion " ( London 1661 ) .  
 In this work it was stated : " And as these are our general ends and motives , so we are induced to insist upon the forms of a synodical government , conjunct with a fixed presidency or episcopacy ; for these reasons :

1. We have reason to believe that no other terms will be so generally agreed on ....
2. It being agreeable to the Scripture and primitive government , is likeliest to be the way of a more universal concord , if ever the churches on earth arrive at such a blessing :however , it will be most acceptable to God and well informed consciences .
- 3 . It will promote the practice of discipline and godliness without discord , and promote order without hindering discipline and godliness .
- 4 . And it is not to be silenced ( though in some respects we are loth to mention it ) that it will save the nations from the solemn vow and Covenant, without wronging the Church at all , or breaking any other oath ..... "

It is then stated that " the prelacy disclaimed in that covenant , was the engrossing the sole power of ordination and



jurisdiction , and exercising of the whole discipline , absolutely by bishops themselves , and their delegates , chancellors , surrogates , and officials .... excluding wholly the pastors of particular churches from all share in it ... " Leighton then argues that this was the position both of the English Parliament and the Westminster Assembly in respect to the Covenant .He quotes Baxter : " That they understood it not to be against all Episcopacy , but only against that particular frame ;" ( Baxter of Church Government vol. II pp 275-97,330 .Baillie , however , understood " all kinds of Episcopacy " vide Letters vol 2 pp 228 252 ff also Charles Wordsworth's - **Outlines** of the Christian Ministry p 78 for Baxter's agreement with Ussher) that the **dissatisfied** brethren were " leaving their stations " and not willing to co-operate ( Pearson op cit vol. 2 p 647 ) .

To the objection : " But some will say , that we are engaged against Prelacy by covenant , and therefore cannot yield to so much as you do , without perjury " Leighton replies :

I. When that Covenant was presented to the assembly with the bare name of Prelacy joined to Popery , many contrary and reverend divines desired that the word ( Prelacy ) might be explained , because it was not all Episcopacy they were against ; and thereupon the following clause was given by way of explication , in these words : " That the church government by arch-

bishops , bishops , their chancellors , and commissaries deans , and chapters , archdeacons , and all the other ecclesiastical offices depending on that hierarchy . By which it appears , that it was only the English hierachy, or frame , that was covenanted against ; and that which was then existent , that was taken down .

2. When the House of Lords took the Covenant , MrThomas Coleman , that gave it them , did so explain it , and profess that it was not their intent to covenant against all Episcopacy ; and upon this explication it was taken; and certainly the Parliament was most capable of giving the due sense of it , seeing it was they that did impose it .

3. And it could not be all Episcopacy that was excluded , because a parochial Episcopacy was at that same time used and approved commonly in England .

4 . And in Scotland they had used the help of visitors, for reformation of their churches , committing the care of a country or circuit to some one man , which was as high a sort of Episcopacy at least as any I am pleading for ; besides that they had moderators in all their synods , which were temporary .

5. Also , the chief divines of the late Assembly at Westminster , that recommended that Covenant to the

nations , have professed their own judgement for such a moderate Episcopacy as I am here defending , and therefore they never contended the exclusion of this by covenant .

Having thus justified the Covenanting Oath as being consistent with a moderate Episcopacy he shows that although they have retained such offices as Dean , Chapter and Commissaries they do not exercise any discipline by delegation from the bishop " with total exclusion of the community of presbyters from all power and share in it " ( Pearson op cit p 648 ) .

Leighton would not deny that the generality of people , even of the ministers took the Covenant as against all Episcopacy , even the most moderate : " Especially if it should be restored under the express name of bishops and archbishops ; never considering how different the nature and model , and way of exercising it , might be thought on under these names and that the due regulating of the thing is much more to be regarded than either the retaining or altering the name " . Thus " unless they can make it appear that the Episcopacy now in question with us in Scotland is either contrary to the Word of God , or to that mitigated sense of their own oath , it would seem more suitable to Christian charity and moderation rather to yield to it , as tolerable at least , than to continue so inflexibly to their first mistakes , and excessive

zeal for love of it , as to divide from the Church , and break the bond of peace " ( ibid p 649 ) .

In conclusion " the truth is , that , besides many other evils , the iniquity and unhappiness of such oaths and covenants lie much in this , that being commonly framed by persons that , even amongst themselves , are not fully of one mind , but have their different opinions and interests to serve , ( and it was so even in this ) they commonly patch up so many several articles and clauses , and those , too , of so versitile and ambiguous terms , that they prove most wretched snares and thickets of briers and thorns to the consciences of those who are engaged in them , about the true sense and intendment , and the ties and obligations of those doubtful clauses ; especially in such alterations and revolutions of affairs as alway may , and often do , even within few years , follow after them ; for the medals and productions of such devices are not usually long-lived ( Pearson op cit p 649 ) . In contrast : " they that now govern in this Church cannot be charged with anythhing near or like unto it ; for whatsoever they require of intrants to the ministry, they require neither subscriptions nor oaths of ministers already entered , and far less of the whole body of the people . And it were ingenuously done to take some notice

of any point of moderation or whatever else is really commendable , even in those we account our greatest enemies , and not to take any party in the world for the absolute standard and unfailing rule of truth and righteousness in all things" ( ibid p 650 ) .Thus there was a contrast between the broad stability of a moderate episcopacy founded upon ancient precedent and the uneasy yoke of a strict presbyterianism of more immediate precedent .

Leighton's liberalism has been associated with his statement " The mode of church government is immaterial; but peace and concord , kindness and good-will , are indispensable " ( Pearson op cit p 64 ; Row's Blair p 398 ) .This was the spirit that encouraged the opposition both of the rigid prelatists and the strict presbyterians .His latitudinarianism was not , on the other hand , due to lack of the logic of church order but rather due to his attachment to principles he conceived would ensure stability in the prevailing establishment . The Church could not cure souls until it had been itself cured of the present distempers.In this he was in the true succession of such apostles as Cowper ,Patrick Forbes and Charteris .Mathieson says of him " it may truly be said that he embodied nearly all that the Church of Scotland had yet been , and very much of what in its narrower compass it was still to be .With the exception

of the patriotic movement which culminated at Worcester , every phase of Scottish ecclesiastical history from the Reformation to the Revolution was represented in him .To the evangelical piety of Rutherford and an absorption in religion equal to that which had caused Knox and Melville to **override all secular and political claims** , he added the Laudian love of ritual and much more than the Laudian liberality of creed , and a latitude in regard to questions of ecclesiastical polity far wider than that of Spottiswoode in his best days , of Cowper and of Patrick Forbes " ( Mathieson op cit vol. 2 p 256 ) . A consideration of his Charges shows that this spirit did not diminish one iota his attachment to the Catholic essentia ( Charges to the Clergy of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane Sept 1662 Pearson op cit vol. 2 p 657 ff ) .

To what cause then can we assign the failure of Leighton's accommodation ? There can be no doubt that the great weakness of his position lay in his isolation .If Nairn, Charteris or Gilbert Burnet could have been persuaded to adorn the Scotch episcopate the history of the accommodation might have been very different ( vide Mathieson op cit vol. 2 p 254 ) . We must be, however , on our guard to see that this sense of isolation is not unduly stressed .It was as much political as theological . George Sanderson , Rector of Croglin 1671 -1691 writing to his patron , Lord Wharton

on Dec. 30 th 1661 says " When I was att London by the advice of many Reverend friends ( especially Dr Reignolds the Bp of Norwich , who in the presence of Dr Wharton both directed & encouraged my adadress that way ) and so did Mr Jackson whome I found with your Honr . and many others I went to the Bp of Galloway and had orders from him , without any rigid ( and indeed feared ) Impositions : whence we are willing to believe that I am rendered more capable of their acceptance " ( Rawlinson mss 52 , fol. 97 ; Nightingale The Ejected of 1662 in Cumberland & Westmoreland vol. 2 - p 1388 ) . Thus the liberal views of Leighton were shared by at least Hamilton to whom it seems evident many of the troubled clergy turned upon the passing of the Act of Uniformity ( Fleetwood Works 1854 vol 3 p 201 ) It is of some significance that Leighton's work seems to have had some immediate influence on attempts at comprehension in England . Bishop Ken had been commissioned by Lloyd ( Bishop of St Asaph ) and later by Compton , Bishop of London , to explore the possibility of union with the Dutch Churches as the obvious move to initiate a similar movement at home . He was able to assure the Dutch Church that the Church of England would not insist on a formal condemnation of their previous ministerial labours but would consent to their acceptance of her ordination as legitimising their ministrations under her polity ( Dean Plumtree Thomas Ken vol. I pp 145-8 ) . This was

again the basis of the proposal made by Tillotson in the abortive Commission appointed with a view to re-union with the English Dissenters in 1689 ( *ibid* p 147 ) .Leighton's cumulative view of orders seemed to have been the precedent in both cases .

We have seen that Ussher 's accommodation owed not a little to the Irenicum ,The same scholastic influence can be detected in the work of Leighton who cannot have been unaffected by his distinguished predecessors in the same field .In contrast to Ussher Leighton had to relate his scheme to a situation of extreme urgency necessitating the practical implementation of presbyterial exaltation .Whether the accommodation would have diminished the apostolic pre-eminence of the episcopate was the point at issue between him and the party represented by Archbishop Burnet ( *vide* Dr W. Lowrie's Problems of Church Unity p 230 for his criticism of St Jerome's theory ) .Perhaps Leighton was too sanguine in his hopes that the situation would adjust itself once the constitutional episcopate had been accepted but at least in this he had the encouragement of knowing that this had all but been the case in 1610 .He did have his doubts about this when confronted with later developments in the opposition of the stricter presbyterians ( *Pearson op cit* vol. I p 50 ) .

It was the complaint of Hutchinson that the Bishop of the Accommodation suppressed the ruling elder ( *Case of the Accommodation* 1677 edit . pp 12-19) .Indeed , as in Ussher's scheme the place of



the laity was not defined but since the provincial courts of the Church had more or less continued to function throughout the episcopal periods it may have been thought that this matter was of lesser import ( vide J. Cooper Reunion A Voice from Scotland p 93 ) .What was more important was the suppression of the General Assembly . Without coming to terms on this issue there could have been no successful accommodation with the Presbyterian polity . Leighton , through force of circumstance no doubt , was not able to face the issue until it was too late .The attempts to revive the National Assembly were in fact too belated to have any effect on Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .It may have been that the failure of the accommodation was due more to constitutional rather than ecclesiastical difficulties but so inseparable were they that their interaction made them a formidable opposition springing from the very depths of the people ( G.M. Trevelyan -English Social History 3 rd Edit . 1946 pp 439 - 446 ) .

It is the conclusion of Mathieson that the final establishment of the Revolution was in reality both a solution of continuity & yet a continuity .This paradox he explains by paying great tribute to Leighton and the many of his school " Unhappily , in its enlightened attempt to reconcile the forms of Presbytery with what had hitherto been regarded as the prelatical spirit , the statesmanship of the Revolution was in itself to be the origin of a permanent schism ; for not only did the mass of the clergy refuse to conform but all subsequent secessions may be traced to the fact

that , whilst professedly Presbyterian , the Church has fallen into line with that great moderate tradition - the tradition of light and reason , of ' peace and concord , kindness and goodwill ' - which Episcopacy of the true Scottish type , from Cowper and Patrick Forbes to Leighton and Charteris , had endeavoured to uphold " ( Mathieson op cit vol. 2 p 374 ) .

### THE LATITUDINARIANS

The opinions of the English 18 th century Latitudinarians is some interest to our present inquiry : In 1707 Archbishop Sharp of York stated that if he were abroad he would willingly communicate with the Protestant Churches where he should happen to be ( W.H.G.Thomas-The Church of England in relation to Other Reformed Churches " The Constructive quarterly Vol. II Sept 1914 ) . In the same year , that of the Union , Tenison , Archbishop of Canterbury could say he " thought the narrow notions of all Churches had been their ruin and he believed the Church of Scotland to be as true a Protestant Church as the Church of England , though he could not say that it was as perfect " ( W.H.Griffith Thomas op cit ) .William Wake , Archbishop of Canterbury 1716-37 , writes " The Reformed Churches , though differing in some points from our English Church , I willingly embrace .I could have wished indeed that the Episcopal form of government had been retained by all of them ..... Meanwhile , far be it from me that I should be so iron-hearted as to believe , that , on account of such a defect ( let me be permitted without offence to call it so ) , any of them ought to be cut off from our communion, or with certain mad writers among us , to declare that they have no true and valid sacraments, and thus are scarcely

Christians " ( Hunkin op cit p 59 ; Mosheim Eccl. Hist .1845 edit . vol. IV p 378 ) . Archbishop Secker ( 1764 ) writes :

" Without maintaining that they have no gospel ministers , or sacraments , or ordinances , or churches , we may apprehend — whether rightly or wrongly is not to be disputed now , but sincerely , however - that episcopacy is of apostolic institution , and that scripture affords as good proof of this as of the appointment of infant baptism and the Lord's Day " ( Nine Sermons pp 261-2 ) . William Warburton , Bishop of Gloucester ( 1759-79 ) in a postscript to the Fourth Edition of his " Alliance Between Church and State published in 1766 in replying to Lord Bolingbroke 's criticism of his work supports his doctrine of the variability of Church Government " Because Church -government may be administered by an Episcopacy, a Presbytery , or an Independency ..... The specific form of Church -government amongst Christians was not prescribed , and therefore none seems intended to be invariably followed, because Jesus did not unite his religion to the state , but left it to particular churches to follow such as were most agreeable to the form of those Civil Societies , in which they were established" ( Works Vol. VII p 368 ) . George Pretyman Tomline , Bishop of Winchester ( 1820-27 ) writes : " I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every Church should be governed by Bishops .No Church can exist with-

out some government; but though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the affairs of public worship , though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree yet it does not follow , that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country ; they may vary with the extent of a country , the manners of its inhabitants , the nature of its civil government , and many other peculiarities which might be specified ..... As the Scriptures do not prescribe any definite form of church -government , so they contain no directions concerning the establishment of a power by which ministers are to be admitted to their sacred office " ( Exposition of Articles , 1799 , pp 96-8 , Sect . Art XX III ) . On the other hand William Law and Charles Daubeny saw the necessity of maintaining the Apostolic Succession inviolate and as such are representative of the " Catholic " strain ever present , even in that Latitudinarian age ( William Law - Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor , 1717 in Westminster Library Reprint p 102 ff ; Charles Daubeny , Appendix , 1799 , vol. I pp 353 -56 ) . Bramhall , the Irish Primate , seems like Andrews and Cosins to have been a worthy predecessor to these latter. To him the episcopal form was the " via tutissima , " I do not make this way to be simply necessary but only show what is safest " ( Bramhall's Serpent Salve A.C.L. Edit. vol. III

pp 475-6 ) .Indeed it seems that Bramhall's objections to the reformed ministry was based upon the novelty of government by a body of elders , and not upon the absence of bishops episcopally ordained ( H.A. Wilson op cit . p187 ) . It is interesting to find that when some Scottish ministers wishing to conform were re-ordained conditionally by the Primate; in the letters of orders given them were inserted the following words " Non annihilantes priores ordines ( si quos habuit ) nec invaliditatem eorundem determinantes , multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes ( quas proprio Judici relinquimus ) sed solummodo suppletentes quicquid prius defuit per canones Ecclesiae Anglicanae requisitum " ( Bramhall's Works A.C.L. edit. Vol. I p XXXVII ) . Although such ordination has by some scholars been not considered "conditional " it was considered a precedent in his own time and by those promoting the 1689 Comprehension Scheme ( Haddon Apostolic Succession in the Church of England p 165 ; H.A.Wilson op cit p 188 ) . Dr Norman Sykes has shown the evolution of the Anglican apologetical activity was in part necessitated by the attitude of those who like the opposers of Bancroft claimed a divine right for their reformed systems .At first the Anglican divines tended to be defensive ,almost apologetical, then they took the offensive . ( vide The Church of England and Non-episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Occasional Papers -Theology Pamphlet S.P.C.K. Lond . 1948 ) .  
 Bramhall represents the interim view . Thus in a real sense  
 we may claim that the Latitudinarian view is the primitive  
 tradition of reformed episcopacy even if not representative of  
 contemporary Anglicanism .

Whilst then we should be cautious about accepting  
 the Latitudinarians as representative, it did nevertheless  
 represent those , who , unlike the non-jurors (Anglican and  
 Scotian ) thought that religious and political issues were  
 compatible .In this they were heirs to the Fuhrerprinzip  
 of the first reformers . Thus in 1705 there appeared the book  
 " A Draught for a National Church Accommodation whereby the  
 Subjects of England and Scotland ,However different in their  
 Judgements Concerning Episcopacy and Presbytery , may yet be  
 united , in regard to the Queen's Headship over Both in One  
 Church and Kingdom of Great Britain " ( Published anonymously  
 London 1705 ; John Humphrey is the reputed author vide Glosser  
 note op cit p 222 ) .The main points of the accommodation  
 were :

1. Union in worship not desired but union in  
 Government .
2. The Church of England must be made the political  
 society for all Christians in the land , both  
 Conforming and Tolerating , with the Queen as the

head and with the Bishops as organisers .

3. The Church must come under a double consideration viz . the Church of Christ and as the Church of England . Considered in the former aspect , there will be all sorts of differences of opinion , but considered as a National Church it can easily be made one .

4 . The Bishops to be the Queen's officers with only objective ecclesiastical powers .

5 . The office of Bishop being thus defined , it would be politic for her Majesty to appoint as Bishops Dissenters , as well as those who conformed .

6 . A third Clerk for the Convocation could be added to the two in every diocese , and he should be chosen from the Dissenters.

7. The Convocations of Canterbury and York should be united into one Assembly .

8 . Both Simony and pluralities must be abolished; they " are the pests of the Conforming Clergy " .

9 . There would be no persecution for failure to conform for conscience' sake ( vide Slosser op cit . p222 ) .



The question naturally arises : Why was it , with the Latitudinarian ascendancy , that efforts were not made to effect an accommodation between the two national churches ? It has indeed been said " there seem to have been few , if any , approaches as between the Churches of England and Scotland during the whole of the eighteenth century". ( G.J.Slosser Christian Unity op cit p 222 ) .Perhaps the answer to this enigma may lie in the assertion that the newly established Presbyterian Church had no desire, as yet , for further experiment with Episcopacy. Again , the very structure of the Union was reared on a foundation of polity involving the maintainance of the presbyterian establishment ( Acta Parl Scot XI pp 402-14 ; De Foe History of Union pp 480; 625 ) .Nothing likely to interfere with the settlement could possibly receive official encouragement .

Hardly a month after the appearance of a French fleet off Montrose in March 1708 Carstares , again Moderator of the Assembly , could assure the queen " they had an equal detestation of the counsels of Versailles and the pretensions of St Germain " ( Acts of the Assembly p 423 ) .But the Episcopal party could not as yet subscribe to such a statement .It was not before Prince Charles Edward died in Rome on Jan. 31 st 1788 and was succeeded by his only brother , Henry , Cardinal Henry the Ninth , that in the Episcopal and Diocesan Synods the Bishops and Clergy agreed to recognise George III as their right-

ful sovereign ( W. Stephen op cit vol. 2 p 550 ). It was  
 Fuhrerprinzip with a difference ; the Episcopal party had been  
 contaminated with the leprosy of treason ,romantic and dis-  
 interested though it had been .Was it likely that the Assembly  
 would risk infection ? Events had vindicated this relationship.  
 When James landed at Peterhead on Dec. 22 nd 1715 the Episcopal  
 clergy presented an address of their attachment .They also  
 appointed a day of thanksgiving for his safe arrival .But the  
 " shaky " Cavalier attended none of their services ! The result  
 of their open avowal was , naturally enough , the Penal Act  
 of April 1719 by which no Episcopal minister could officiate in  
 any place where nine or more persons , in addition to the  
 members of the household , were present unless he had taken the  
 oath of Abjuration and prayed for the King ( Stephen op cit p  
 481 ) .Following the insurrection of 1745 the penal laws of 1746  
 and 1748 virtually abolished the "legality " of Scottish Episcop-  
 al Orders ( Thomas Stephen History vol. IV pp 327-9 ;Grub vol.  
 IV p 37 ; Skinner History vol. 2 p 663 ) .Thus by 1748 the  
 Episcopal Church of Scotland was according to this world's laws  
 abolished ,It is significant that the act of 1748 ,declaring  
 Scottish orders null and void after Sept .29 th of that year ,  
 was opposed by the English bishops in the Lords ( W.Stephen vol.2  
 p 519 ) .Under George III the penal acts were not rigidly enfor-  
 ced .Indeed the consecration of Bishop Seabury as first bishop of

the Protestant Episcopal Church of America on Sunday Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> 1784 , by bishops Kilgour , Petrie and Skinner is evidence that the Episcopal cause was still capable of new life .Following the **Convention** of Laurencekirk a Bill was passed in 1792 relieving the Episcopal Clergy from the penalties attached to the exercise of their ministry with the proviso that they should be incapable of holding English benefices and that they should subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles as showing their doctrinal agreement with the Church of England .By the Clerical Disabilities Act of 1864 the Episcopal clergy were finally emancipated from the latter provisions of the 1792 Act ( MS Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops vol. III pp319-333).It might not be too curious a paradox to assert that the disestablished church had at last been delivered from her Erastian chains .It would seem , therefore , that owing to the political issues involved ,Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation could hardly have been attempted in Scotland during the 18<sup>th</sup> century .There is one other important consideration we cannot afford to neglect in an examination of this problem : Calamy says " The English Dissenters were very much for this Union ( 1707 ) , as the most effectual way for securing the Protestant succession , and even the continuance of their ecclesiastical establishment in North Britain" ( Historical Account of His Own Life vol. II p 44 ) . Indeed the

cause of English Dissent was in no small measure bound up with that of the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland . Any attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation would have raised issues affecting the whole religious settlement of the two kingdoms ; if thoughtful men shrank from such unsettlement during a century of constitutional consolidation ,perhaps they were wise in their generation .

## CHAPTER 10

---

ATTEMPTS AT ACCOMMODATION DURING THE 19th CENTURY  
AND DURING THE EARLY YEARS OF THE 20th CENTURY .

The first half of the 19 th century is characterised as a period of liberal reconstruction. The Reform Act of 1832 was preceded by Catholic Emancipation in 1829 and in Scotland , succeeded by the Clerical Disabilities Act of 1864 . Meanwhile the life of the Church in Scotland was not unaffected by this spirit . There was " the larger hope " of M'Leod Campbell and Erskine which stressed the universality of Redemption . Indeed the Disruption of 1843 was in a real sense a corollary to the liberal logic of the times . It is not suprising therefore that as the century wore on there were some , true to their generation , who were liberal enough to make renewed attempts at presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .

The bill introduced in 1864 by the Duke of Buccleuch for the removal of disabilities which prevented the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church holding office in the Church of England demonstrated the union of a dissenting and a national church ( Stephen op. cit . vol. 2 p. 646 ). There were many who thought it was to the detriment of the Scottish Establishment ; amongst these was Dr Robert Lee ( Life and Remains of Robert Lee D. D. - R. H. Story vol. 2 p117 ) . Although loyally accepting the 1864 Assembly's decision that there was " nothing in the bill requiring any expression of opinion on the part of the General Assembly "

he had misgivings. In Chapter VI of "The Reform of the Church" he had said of the Episcopalian leaders "According to them she (the Establishment) has no right to be the National Church or to exist because, as they teach she has no Divine commission; her ministers are not God's clergy; they want the Episcopate, Episcopal Ordination, and Apostolic Succession, without which no 'teacher' can legitimately or effectually administer the sacraments, or be certain that he has Christ's body and blood to give to the people". And their watchword is this - that they 'the Church of Scotland', therefore the only Church; the other 'bodies' being sects, different forms of 'schism'" (R.H. Story op cit vol. 2 pp118-119). Obviously the Bill would tend to further this Laudian spirit and would mean the exclusion of ministers of the Scottish Establishment from pulpits of the Church of England: "If Scotch Episcopal disabilities were to be withdrawn, he would have the restriction which forbade a minister of the National Church occupying an English pulpit withdrawn also, in the, perhaps vain, hope of a return to the spirit of the liberal days of Knox when there was full ministerial intercourse between the two National Churches" (Life vol. 2 p 120). Arthur Kinnaird, then member for Perth, actually proposed a bill to secure this. It is one of the colossal errors of Scottish Church polity in the

19 th century that " for lack of public spirit in the Scottish clergy , or of popular support , it fell to the ground " ( Story op cit vol. 2 p I20 ) .Dr Lee " had no dread of Episcopacy , and no very great prejudice against the rights and doctrines of the Anglican Church " ( op cit pI2I ) .His liturgical reforms , his efforts to emancipate his Church from the barrenness that characterised its worship , were tendencies of a " Catholic " order .Correspondence with Dean Ramsay had elucidated the latter's definition of Episcopacy : " I do not hold that Episcopacy is essential to the 'esse' of a Church ; I think it an element for the ' bene esse ' of a Church ; perhaps I might add the ' optime esse ' " ( op cit p I33 ) .

In the Autumn of 1864 Dr Rorison ,incumbent of Peterhead Episcopal Church , raised the matter of Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in letters published in the Scotsman .In a letter of August 8 th he says " The Established Church is strong - strong in her legal status , in her rights of spiritual self -government , in her full representation of the laity in the Church Courts , in her invaluable parochial system , in her million,or more , of the Scotch people . But she is weak in her want of liturgical worship , of ancient traditions of Church Orders , of effective and permanent pres-



idency in her Synods , weak in the estrangement of the upper classes , and weak above all , in necessary separation from the Church of England .

Now , the Episcopal Church ( from perfectly intelligible historical causes ) is numerically weak . Her congregations , compared to those of the Establishment , are but as one to seven ; her worshippers but as one to twenty . She may be weak in other respects , which her adversaries are keen -eyed to descry . But in some things she is strong . She is strong in her spiritual independence , and is not likely to part with it . She is strong in her newly acquired trust of the laity , and gradual concession to them of their due share in Church government . She is strong in her respect for ancient order , in her constitutional episcopate , and in her noble liturgy . She is strong in the affection of the upper ranks , and the hereditary allegiance of the Scottish aristocracy . Lastly , she is now strong , far stronger than ever , by the blessing of Providence on the Duke of Buccleuch's effort to recover the confiscated rights of her clergy , and thus to perfect her ecclesiastical relations with the sister Church of England .

These strengths , separated , are , speaking in the large interests of national religion , in a great measure reduced to weakness . These weaknesses by union would be transfigured into

strength".

Writing to Dr Lee on the Sept. 7 th 1864 Dr Rorison asks " whether your aim ( as expressed in the 'Reform ' is essentially inconsistent with that which many in the Episcopal Church have much at Heart , and which I have explained and advocated in the Scotsman " ( Story Life vol. 2 pp124-5 ) .Dr Lee replied that the Reforms he desired in the Scotch Establishment would " remove many obstructions to a union with the Church of England ; and will diminish all . The great difficulty, however , that of orders , is one which the Episcopal Church must remove .I do not see how High Church notions and claims can ever amalgamate with ours , or that we can listen for a moment to proposals which invalidate our orders ( discredit and censure our ministry ) , and those of the other Protestant Churches ".He concludes " it would give tenfold effect to these letters if it were understood that any considerable number of your brethren sympathised in your views " .

Dr Rorison replied : " I feel sure that it will strike you with pleasant surprise to be told, that so far from being isolated , I am satisfied that I have been the spokesman of a great majority in our Church .Nineteen-twentieths of the laity wish reunion ; the southern clergy generally; perhaps half the northern clergy; and ( I think ) five or six of the bishops.The ultra party are noisy , but not now in the

ascendent .Of course I would never pen a line or stir a step on the matter , if I did not believe reunion practicable without the slightest disrespect to the clergy of the Established Church .Their full recognition as ordained Presbyters is a sine qua non .On the other hand , the restoration of a chief pastorate seems to me not only consistent with Presbytery, but dictated by fidelity to the best and wisest precedents of the Scottish Reformation " ( Story Life vol. 2 pp 125-6 ) .

At this stage it was suggested that " a quiet conference " of a few leading clergymen and laymen , Presbyterian and Episcopal, should be held .Lord Rollo suggested they should meet at Perth .Dr Lee seems to have been a little doubtful of the expediency of such a meeting .Writing to Rorison he says : " I am afraid of moving in the direction you indicate, a moment too soon ..... What you say regarding the feelings of the Episcopal clergy surprises and delights me, I was prepared to hear that the laity sympathise generally in the prospect of union " .His view was further expressed : " I will explain to you my policy , which I have not hitherto done to any person. It was to propose in the second part of my work on the Reform of the Church , a scheme of Church government , which might conciliate many of the laity of your Church , and even some of her clergy , as well as a good many members of the Free Church ,

and to wait a little to see the effect of such suggestion. My scheme does not differ much from that you have sent me " . The scheme suggested by Dr Rorison , which may perhaps without injustice be termed the Rorison -Lee Accommodation is summarised as follows :

Tentative basis of adjustment as respects

1. Polity 2. Worship 3. Standards .

I. Polity

- 
- a. The Church to be organised in three jurisdictions, parochial , Provincial , National ; a Primary Synod , a Superior , a Supreme .
- b. The Primary Synod ( homologous to existing ' vestry ' or ' kirk-session ' ) to consist of from six to twelve members elected by the male communicants of the parish . These to hold office for life ; also to be designated to their functions by a religious rite . The minister to be ex officio Moderator or President . Each parish to acquire patronage , by voluntary cession or sale , the right to be exercised through the Parochial Synod ; i.e. the parish elects through electors of its own electing .
- c. The Superior or Intermediate Synod to be gained by halving the existing " synod " , and doubling

the existing presbytery - fusing the two jurisdictions ( as in the U.P. Church ) into one, homogeneous to our " Diocesan Synods " - 33 such synods would be each equivalent to an average Scotch county , an average area of 100,000 souls .Allowing for the sub-division of overgrowth parishes - for which reunion would give facilities, each synod would comprise from forty to fifty parishes ." Synod " and " Diocese " would be interchangeable terms . The thirteen ante-Reformation dioceses would in such cases , be increased by subdivision by 20 others , Edinburgh being one .A superior synod would consist of the parochial synod .The Superior Synod ,like the Primary , to be presided over by a perpetual moderator elected by itself , subject to confirmation by the Supreme Synod . Such Moderator to be duly consecrated a bishop , and to have a seat , with one or more assistant ministers , at some principal church of the diocese .

d. The Supreme Synod would naturally retain its historical title of " General Assembly " , and

would consist .

1. of the 33 bishops , or life -moderators , forming a first chamber .

2. Of 6 members , 3 lay and 3 clerical from each diocese or intermediate synod , and representatives of the Universities , forming a second chamber .

Such chambers to deliberate together , but , on the demand of either , to vote apart , with mutual right of veto .The Moderator to be elected annually from the first chamber of the whole assembly .The lay or clerical members of the second chamber to be exactly equal in number .

e. The Primary Synod to meet monthly ; the Superior , quarterly , the Supreme , annually .

f. The Supreme Synod to exercise its judicial functions through an elected Judicial Committee, holding office for life , composed of 6 members of each chamber ( those chosen from the second to be learned in the law ) ; the senior bishop presiding, and having the casting vote .

## 2. Worship -----

a.

All congregations of the United Church , now using the English Book of Common Prayer , to be guar-

anted its free use during pleasure .

b.

Liturgical worship to be forced on no congregation.

c.

A careful revision of the Book of Common Prayer, assented to by the Heads of the Church of England , to be prepared for the use of such congregations of the Scottish Church as may prefer a more elastic and otherwise improved liturgy .

### 3. Standards

-----

Discussions to be postponed as they would

" in the meantime , be altogether premature and useless "

( Story Life of Robert Lee vol. 2 pp122-30 ) .

The proposed Perth Conference never took place .Apparently Lord Rollo was led to believe that the Conference had better be postponed until after the General Assembly of 1865 .Meanwhile , to use Dr Story's words " in the latter autumn of 1864 the current of public feeling seemed rather to set against any possible union with the Episcopal Church " ( op cit vol. 2 p132 ) .The activities of Dr Tait , then Bishop of London , seemed to have aroused the ire of the Establishment.Dr Lee wrote to Dr Rorison on Nov. 25 th: " I did not like some passages in the bishop's speech at Glasgow, and I cannot but altogether disapprove of his exercising Episcopal functions in Scotland as indecorous and perhaps illegal " ( op cit

vol. 2 p 132 ) .

An invitation had been extended , amongst others to Principal Tulloch .Writing from St Andrews in the December of 1864 he gives , what may be termed , the representative view of the Church of Scotland on Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation :  
 " I candidly confess that the difficulties appear to me serious , if not inseperable , in the way of any project of union .I have much sympathy with the faith of Bishop Wordsworth , and rejoice in his incessant proclamations of a side of truth well nigh forgotten in Scotland - the obligation of unity and the weakness of causeless schism .But he is greatly mistaken in supposing there is any tendency to accept his arguments about Episcopacy among any class of the clergy or members of the National Church- even among those most inclined to Episcopacy on other grounds . He would bring us back to a higher dogmatic ground on the subject of Church government ; but any movement in the National Church towards a more catholic form of Church government and worship be assured , has sprung out of general instincts of culture and feelings of moderation that have no connection with any faith in the 'three orders ' as a dogma .The historical traditions of episcopacy - the decency and beauty of its worship, dissatisfaction with the existing state of worship among ourselves - all have had their influence .But the deepest influence of all has been the



decay of faith in any divine form of Church government at all, in the old dogmatic sense .This is the real root of the present movement in our Church ; for men who have ceased to believe in their own or any form of Church government , as divinely prescribed , have naturally asked , " Why should we not draw nearer to the prevailing type of Catholic worship ? " very much as Leighton felt and asked in his day.Episcopacy is certainly ancient ; its existence may be traced to the verge of the apostolic life , if not within it .It presents in its usages , and especially in its form of worship as exhibited in the Anglican Church ,many advantages .On such practical grounds many agree in our Church ; but as soon as you approach them with the idea of Episcopacy as of divine prescription , as a dogma claiming their acceptance , they are up in arms .They are far beyond the state of mind - unhappily or not - to which arguments of the latter sort address themselves .Dr Wordsworth does not seem to see this , or if he does , he thinks it only a temporary phase of opinion in which , I believe,he is perfectly mistaken ; and all his useful , and in many respects admirable charges, are in consequence charges in the air .

My own conviction is that , as a Church , we will draw nearer to Episcopacy unless some crisis overtakes us ; but it will be entirely on practical grounds and to secure practical objects - more reality of ecclesiastical superintendence, more

propriety and order in worship .The acknowledgment of Bishops as a divine power above presbyters is , so far as I can see , a notion that has utterly died out of the Scottish mind , save in so much as sections of it here and there have been influenced by the teachings of your Church.

If the teaching of your Church and its cherished traditions permitted your abandoning the dogmatic ground and coming forth to meet us on such principles as Leighton proposed, I should not think the idea of a reunion utterly impracticable, but you will excuse me for saying that ,I have not seen any such tendency in your Church .The tendency , I fear , during the last twenty years , has been in the opposite direction, which I have deeply regretted" ( Mrs Oliphant A Memoir of the Life of John Tulloch D.D. ,L.L.D. 3 rd Edit 1889 pp 213-4 ) .

This letter of Principal Tulloch is indeed a brilliant analysis by a mind whose intuition has been amply vindicated by the events in our generation .Clearly the Church of Scotland could not accept any terms suggesting the settlement of 1662 rather than that of 1610 .As Dr Story has commented " If the Church of England and her representatives in Scotland cannot return to the wise and comprehensive policy of earlier times, recognising the validity of Scottish orders , and treating the question of Church government as a subject of reasonable argu-

ent , and not of inflexible dogma , then union is hopeless, and its blessings can never be realised " ( R.H.Story Life and Remains of Robert Lee vol. 2 pp 134-5 ). Another fact militating against the success of a possible conference was the exact position of Dr Rorison .It was not clear whether it was representative or not .Mrs Oliphant comments " I think it very unlikely that Dr Rorison was a man of great influence in his own communion , or that he would have secured the consent of the leaders of his Church to such a foundation of negotiations ; but neither was there any possibility of securing the attention of the other side " ( Mrs Oliphant op cit p 212 ) .It seems reasonably certain that Dr Rorison did present a not inconsiderable element in the Episcopal Church amongst whom were Dean Ramsay ,Bishop Ewing of Argyle and the Isles and possibly Bishop Charles Wordsworth of St Andrews .Dr Story in attributing the failure of the negotiations " in some measure owing to the position assumed by the Bishop of London ,who resided in Scotland this autumn , and identified himself very closely with the Scotch Episcopal body , keeping entirely aloof from any intercourse with the National Church " hardly does justice to the facts ( vide Story op cit vol. 2 p 132 ) .Dr Tait was actually taking extended duty in Argyll for Bishop Ewing ; the

correspondence that passed between the two bishops does not suggest that he was actively opposed to the liberal views of the latter ( Ross's Memoirs of Bishop Ewing 395 ff vide also Stephen op cit vol. 2 p 652 ) .In any case Dr Tait made amends in 1877 for as Archbishop of Canterbury , he was one of the first of England's Primates to visit the General Assembly ( Mrs Oliphant op cit pp 322-3 ) .

The work of Dr Robert Lee and Dr Rorison , great as it was in the cause of unity , cannot be compared to that of Bishop Wordsworth .His labours in the field of Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation were immense .His long episcopate , some forty years ,was a constant effort to promote a love of unity and a horror of schism .It was the greatest service of Charles Wordsworth that he was able to convince Scotland that schism was indeed a horror and not a Christian virtue .In the earlier days he was to use the words of "The Scotsman " A voice crying in the wilderness ( Stephen op cit vol .2 pp680-I ) .Things were very different when at the age of 87 he was buried in the cemetery of the old cathedral at St Andrews mourned by Episcopalian and Presbyterian alike .He travelled widely ,spoke constantly ,wrote much for the cause of unity ; his pamphlets , published charges , historical volumes , number eighty-five not all of which are single volume publications (List by Canon Farquhar , Perth vide Stephen vol. 2 p 682 ) .Bishop Wordsworth promoted the formation of the Scottish Unity Association which includes among its members leaders of the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches .It has held quarterly meetings for prayer and conference ( Prof James Cooper Art ." The Problem of Reunion in Scotland " Church quarterly Review vol. 68 April 1909 ) .His work for unity may be divided into two periods; from 1854 -1866 he was particularly active but the response was

poor .For a while it seemed as if no success would attend his efforts and for a time he did little in the matter .In the winter of 1879-1880 he read Dr Milligan's Croall Lectures when he was much impressed by the assertion " To speak of making the world believe in a risen Lord by mere Bible circulation or missionary exertion is to waste time and strength , unless it is attended by the spectacle of unity " ( G.J.Slosser -Christian Unity p 223 ) . He at once wrote to Dr Milligan agreeing that there had been " too much speaking about unity and too little action " ( The Episcopate of Charles Wordsworth by the Bishop of Salisbury p 226 ) . As a result of this correspondence Dr Milligan , when Moderator of the General Assembly in 1882 , made a plea for the inclusion of Episcopalians in any proposals for reunion ( Church quarterly Review vol. 68 pp 169-70 ; Charles Wordsworth-Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian Unity vol. 2 pp 622-3 ) . A feature of Wordsworth's work is the use he made of correspondence ; his letters to the press , especially to the Scotsman , reached an ever growing public .

Writing to Mr James Hannay , then Editor of the Courant , on Sept . 16 th 1863 Bishop Wordsworth makes specific proposals in the matter of presbyterian -Episcopal Accommodation:

" You are quite right in suggesting that the real difficulty lies in the question of Orders .For my own part , I should be inclined to insist upon Episcopal Ordination ( as being at least more regular ) only for the future , or prospectively ; leaving it to the option

of the existing generations of ministers to receive it or not , or to receive it hypothetically.... But of course ministers who are to be advanced to the Order of Bishops must receive Consecration; and to this I imagine no one would object. The essence of our system , as regards the ministry , is that we have a threefold Ordination-1. Of Deacons , 2 of Priests 3 of Bishops , with increase of solemnity, and of power committed , and ( as we trust ) of grace received , at each successive step . The two former steps are commonly called ' Ordination ' , and the last ' Consecration ' ; but either name might have been used with equal propriety , quoad sensum , for all three . I fear that presbyterian ministers have never been in the habit of looking at the question from this point of view ; but when they begin to do so , I am sure it must approve itself to every reverent and humble mind . To rush at once to the highest office was not allowed even among the heathen. There were degrees of ministerial initiation in the mysteries of Greece , and there was a Pontifex Maximus at Rome . And it is the same even among the Free Masons ! In all nature and in human society we find the principle of gradation. Why not also in the affairs of religion ? " ( C. Wordsworth , Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian Unity vol. 2 pp387-8). Again in the Introduction to a Synodal Address delivered at Perth on Sept . 11 th 1866 : " I have said that prelacy is in no antagonism to the full development of the Synodal system as it has grown up under Presbyter-

ianism .When the time shall arrive for such a reconciliation as that which I have advocated , there will be nothing to prevent the continuance of that system 1.Kirk Sessions will remain , as corresponding to our Vestries 2 Presbyteries will remain, as corresponding to Rural Deaneries , not yet revived among ourselves , from the scantiness of our numbers , but revived in England .

3 . Synods will remain, as corresponding to our Diocesan Synods.

4 . Above all the General Assembly will remain , only with Bishops constituting an Upper Chamber , and having the control of judicial processes .There is nothing in such a system to stand in the way of intercommunion with the Church of England , with the Irish Church , with the American Church , and with the Anglican Churches throughout the world " ( Public Appeals vol. 2 p 466 ) . Again ,  
 " And therefore I do not hesitate to declare we have no quarrel with the existing Church Establishment as such .Let it hold forth to us a standard around which we may rally , in the fear of God and with a safe conscience , and gladly will we do so ,not as of choice merely , but as of duty , as of necessity .Make the standard , I would say , as you please , provided it secure to us the needful bonds of Unity , viz ., the catholic ministry and the catholic Creeds .Let the diocese be large or small .Let there be the use not only of liturgical worship , but ( if the concession be insisted on ) of prayer also , to some extent , at the discretion of the minister .I need not say let the rights of individual Congregations be assured to them , for these ,according to our



present system , they already possess .Neither need I say let the exercise of patronage be so vested as to secure a due control over the appointment of incumbents , for such control is already our's .Neither need I say let the election of Bishops be open both to the Clergy and Laity of the diocese , for such our Episcopal elections now are .Nor , once more , need I say let there be legislation , let there be judicature , let there be executive administration in and by Synods of various kinds and of several degrees of power ; for these,too , we already have , if not to the full extent in which they exist in the Presbyterian scheme , yet to a greater degree , and in more active force , than our Presbyterian brethren perhaps are at all generally aware .The truth -t is we ( I mean the Episcopal Church in this country ) are apt to be judged by our fellow -countrymen from a point of view which applies properly to the Church of England ; whereas our system is not only free and independent of all external control , but it aproximates far more closely than the English system does to the Presbyterian platform " ( op cit pp 467-69 ) .

He did not , as was sometimes suggested ignore the distinctive principles which divided Presbyterianism and Episcopacy .In his " Outlines of the Christian Ministry " he

gives good evidence of this ( C. Wordsworth Outlines of the Christian Ministry p 92 ) .He held that it was clearly demonstrable that Episcopacy was the *bene esse* of the Church.

That it was the *esse* he held could not be equally demonstrable ( Canon Cowley -Brown : Bishop Charles Wordsworth and the Union of the Churches -Church Unity Papers 1911-13 pp 182-3) .

It must be confessed , on the negative side ,that Bishop Wordsworth's work is sometimes characterised by a certain *naïveté* .On one occasion he reasons from Presbyterian parity : " .... it may be added that the levelling of ranks among the clergy , consequent upon the discontinuance of the three orders , has involved the lowering of their social position , and the withdrawal of all those dignities and distinctions which , sometimes combining leisure ( more or less ) with emolument , were wont to be spoken of as ' prizes ' in the Church " .He then proceeds to quote a speech by Bright made in Edinburgh on Nov. 3<sup>rd</sup> 1868 when he said " nearly all Scotchmen know something about India , especially what are called the more comfortable and wealthier classes ; for there is hardly one of their families which has not sent some members out to make their fortune in that distant country " .Wordsworth then makes the astonishing comment : " The cause of this will be found mainly ,I believe , in the presbyterianism of this country , which has thus bene-

fitted India at the expense of the fatherland " ( C.Wordsworth Outlines of the Christian Ministry pp 239-40 ) . In the judgement of Dr Ball " the bishop's personal qualities went far to neutralize the power of his endeavours , and this notwithstanding his splendid scholarship and generous devotion to the cause of the Episcopal Church .He was a man of moods , unduly sanguine when his proposals seemed to gain acceptance , unnecessarily depressed when they were ill received ; hence neither side felt certain what the bishop might say or do next ; the effect of this was inevitable " ( Thos.I Ball art The Reunion Problem - a Scottish Episcopal View - Church Quarterly Review vol 68 July 1909 ) .The service , he rendered is well recorded in his own epitaph :

" Remembering the prayer of his Divine Lord and Master  
For the Unity of His Church on earth ,  
He prayed continually and laboured earnestly  
That a way may be found , in God's good time ,  
For the reunion of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian bodies  
Without the sacrifice of Catholic principle or Scriptural  
Truth . " .

The work of Dr Alexander Ewing , Bishop of Argyll and the Isles 1847-73 is also of some significance to this inquiry . He was early in life much influenced by M'Leod Campbell of Row and Thomas Erskine of Linlathen .Of these he said : "Campbell's words and those of my first teacher Erskine form a double star which has brightened an otherwise dark and dreary night " ( J.C. Lees St Giles Lectures Edin 1883 p 360 ; Ross -Memoir of Bishop Alexander Ewing ;London 1877 p 360 ) . His cordial acceptance of the glorious affirmation expressed in the Church of England Catechism that " Christ has redeemed me and all mankind " was one of the main reasons for his entering the ministry of the Episcopal Church rather than that of the Church of Scotland ( Ross op cit pp81 & 355 ) .In referring to the Dunbar Case he shewed that his views on Church Order were not subjective " A man need not be an Episcopalian unless he chooses , but if he chooses to be such , he must comply with the conditions requisite in the case . And one of these conditions is simply subjection to diocesan authority , not in the abstract , which might mean anything or nothing , but in the concrete form of obedience to one's Ordinary while he is administering the law to which he himself as well as his clergy has owed submission " ( Ross op cit p106 vide also A.Ewing "Episcopacy in Scotland " for a review of the case ) .In the tract

"Episcopacy in Scotland " he maintains that Episcopacy is divine because it possessed the true doctrine of the " redemption of the world "; again , " as is the soul without the body , so is true doctrine without the Church " yet " as is the body without the soul , so is the church without true doctrine " ( vide Ross op cit p 107 ) . He was thus in the great Arminian tradition associated with such Episcopalians as Gilbert Burnet ( G.D.Henderson -Religious Life in Seventeenth Scotland p 92 ) .

He did much to deliver the Episcopal Church from its isolation .He travelled widely on the continent and was the first Scotch Bishop , for over a century to assist the English Bishops in a celebration of the Holy Communion which took place in Westminster Abbey on June 16 th 1851 ( Diary June 16 th Ross op cit p 191 ) .The Clerical Disabilities Act of 1864 , which relieved the Scottish Episcopal clergy from a great burden was mainly due to his friendship with Dr Tait , then Bishop of London and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury ( Ross op cit p363). In connection with a proposed scheme for a Reformed Episcopal Church of Italy he shewed his willingness to communicate the succession to the Waldenses ;However , Episcopacy , even at this period of his life , was a secondary thing to Bishop Ewing , compared with the profounder interests of Protestantism itself "

( Ross op cit p 229 ) .The Spectator of July 7 th 1866 was pleased to say of his " Address to The Younger Clergy " that " We do not know of a single bishop in the English Episcopate who could have produced so bold , Catholic , and thoroughly Apostolic an address as that of , we imagine , the only liberal bishop in the Scotch branch of our Church , the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles " .

Bishop Ewing had no illusions about the evidences of Church history .Writing to Bishop Wordsworth in 1866 he says of the old Celtic Church that it " possessed an organisation very little like 'our platform ' .It was , no doubt , as little like the Presbyterian " ( Ross op cit p 441 ) .In a letter to The Times dated Oct . 1 st 1866 he ventilated the question of union with the Established Church of Scotland and the same issue was broached in letters to various correspondents among whom was Dr Norman McLeod .He felt that the time was not opportune for Presbyterians and Episcopalians to entertain any formal proposals for union .He did not think it likely that even his fellow ' liberal ; Dr Wordsworth , would surrender his belief in the virtue of the Apostolic Succession or that any considerable number of Presbyterian clergymen were prepared to relax their hold on the " decrees of the Confession of Faith " .He felt , however , that a beginning might be made with immediate intercommunion ( Ross op cit p 453 ) .Meanwhile he had attacked

those , who coming increasingly under the influence of the Tractarians , sought the " fatal effects of substituting a mechanical instrumentality in place of the direct inflowings of the light of God on the soul " ( Ross op cit p 454; vide also The Relations of the Church of England to Foreign Churches , and some Examinations of her Present Position " by Alexander Ewing D.C.L. , Bishop of Argyll and the Isles .London Thomas Bosworth ,1866 ) .Writing to the Bishop of St Andrews on March 19 th 1868 he again mentions the question of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation : " As to Scotland , no doubt your views have been that they should come to us ; and mine , that we should go to them " ( Ross op cit p 494 ) . In a charge delivered at Lochgilphead on Sept 19 th 1866 he had again tried to further this cause .Of this the Greenock Daily Telegraph said " No nobler , truer words than these have fallen from the lips of a bishop in Scotland since the gentle Leighton was heard within the cathedral of Dunblane"( vide Ross op cit p 455 ) .Like Leighton , indeed , he keenly felt his isolation . His position is illustrated in the predicament he found himself when , on accepting the invitation of the Glasgow Senatus to preach in the new university hall , he was interdicted from doing so by the Bishop of Glasgow .

Writing to Bishop Wordsworth on Oct. 14<sup>th</sup> 1871 he says :

" I was to use the Liturgy if I willed , and I saw no objection to officiating . On the contrary , I rejoiced at the prospect, and this not because I was to use the Liturgy, but because I could thus join in the worship of a common Redeemer, with brethren divided from us by no insurmountable barriers . But this is not to be ; that is to say if the interdiction I have received is allowed to stand . I now allude to it because the facts are well known , and besides I mention it as the question is being forced upon us , and we must answer it , both to ourselves and to those among whom we live here ' what is the object of our ministry ? ' I confess that if the spirit of which I complain represents the spirit of our Scotch Episcopal Church , it is a grave question with me , and I am sure it is also with you , whether we should take part in a ministry which has so manifestly departed from the object for which it was instituted . For , is not fellowship the end of the Christian ministry , and is it not the work of a true ministry to achieve its end by producing union on the way ? Episcopacy , as you well know , while claiming superiority of degree , for the well being of the Church , never did , among us claim to be necessary for its being " ( Ross op cit p 557; Rt. Rev. Alexander Ewing " A Sermon for Christmas Time 1871-72



with Preface Explanatory Glasgow 1871 .This was the text of the interdicted sermon ) .These sentiments , expressed also in the unspoken university sermon and in its preface were criticised in various quarters .A large number of presbyters in the diocese of Aberdeen petitioned the Bishop requiring him to explain his views .He commented " I certainly do not believe that apostolic succession is needful , any more than I believe that it is needful for the queen to be a Stuart to be a queen " ( Ross op cit p 571 .Dr A.Ewing Article " Anglo-Catholicism .The Contemporary Review Sept . 1872 ) . In Sept.1872 certain of the Bishops met to consider the memorial of the Aberdeen presbyters .In a letter to Bishop Wordsworth dated Oct . 4 th 1872 he says " I am summoned to Perth to stand my trial " ( Ross op cit p 605 ) . The " Deliverance " of the Bishops was " that they have placed quotations on Church government from the ordinals and canons over against quotations from my preface , leaving out all personal application.This is what I think they ought to have done , and if the 'Deliverance ' does not open the door , it does not shut it beyond what it was before ; and therefore , so far as I am concerned , I am to be let off " ( Ross op cit p 607 ) .

Bishop Ewing represents the liberal tradition of the Scottish Episcopal Church ; he was indeed its last representative, heir to Spottiswoode , Leighton and Burnet , before

the ascendancy of the prevailing Anglo-Catholicism. Even more liberal than Wordsworth ( whose position inspite of many explanations remains somewhat obscure ) his great contribution to the cause of unity has been rather conveniently forgotten. Also in the tradition of Leighton was his deep devotional life. His meditations deserve to rank with the best devotional literature of the Christian Church and perhaps , in a day not far distant , will do so ( M.J.Roberts , Art.Bishop Ewing of Argyll and the Isles - A Great Liberal - The Scottish Guardian Vol. XVII No 879 Nov. 7 th 1947 ) . His death took place on Ascension Day 1873 .

The death of Bishop Charles Wordsworth on Dec. 5<sup>th</sup> 1892 was followed just a year later by that of Dr Milligan .Both were truly representative of that increasing number in each communion sympathetic to the cause of accommodation .It will be of interest to this inquiry to note some of those within the Established Church who during the 19<sup>th</sup> century did much for the cause of unity .

In the beginning of the century Dr Candlish , in moving the Act of the 1839 Assembly bringing back the Associate Synod to the Establishment said he trusted " it might be the beginning of that ingathering by which the Church of Scotland might yet be the Church of all people of the land " ( The Ten Year's Conflict vol. II p 62 ) . When he left the establishment at the Disruption it was not with any diminution of " the larger hope " ; rather that their action in reverting to apostolic principles of spiritual freedom would ultimately promote a true union in the future ,History has certainly vindicated this view .In 1873 , still with unspent vigour he could nobly prophesy in his Assembly " the tide of Christian opinion and Christian feeling will grow and swell and accumulate till every barrier shall be thrown down , and all shall be one mind to unite in the Lord .Possibly the way may be prepared for even a wider union " ( Wilson -Memorials of Candlish p 537 ) .In 1861 Dr Bisset , Moderator of the

of the General Assembly for that year made a memorable appeal for unity ( Dr Bisset -Moderator's Address 1861 ) .He did not wish anything to be said for the future about " the divine right " of either of the two Established Churches of Great Britain as they now exist ( Address p 10 ,C. Wordsworth Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian Unity vol. i p 327 ; Church Quarterly Review vol. LXVIII p 167 ) . In 1868 ,Dr Pirie , Moderator of that year , in his closing Address to the Assembly invited those separated from the Established Church " to come forward and state the grounds of their separation , with the view and in the hope that such communications ( which it was promised , should be received and considered with all candour and good faith ) might lead to reconciliation " ( Wordworth Public Appeals Vol. II p 394 ) . The redoubtable Bishop of St Andrews was the only representative member of another denomination to accept the invitation. However , nothing came of the proposals ( ibid p 395 ) .The Lee -Rorison accommodation of 1864 , the influence of Principal Tulloch and Dr Story continued to keep the question of Presbyterian -Episcopal relations before the public eye .Dr Charteris , the succeeding figure of polity seems , however, to represent a reaction : " the one object set before the Church of Scotland was a purely Presbyterian reunion on lines that gave little prospect of anything further or better " ( Prof .J.Cooper The Problem of Reunion in Scotland C.Q.R. vol.

LXVIII April 1909 p 169 ) .Meanwhile in 1866 Principal Campbell of Aberdeen in his work on "The Theory of the Ruling Eldership" praised "the admirable constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States which combines the advantages of Presbytery and Episcopacy " pleading also " surely the visible Church is not always to remain in its present divided condition " ( C.Q.R. Vol. LXVIII -April 1909 p 169 ) .

Following the somewhat negative influence associated with the views of Principal Pirie and Dr Charteris little was done to further the cause of accommodation although it is significant that the Church Service Society was founded in 1867 which attempted to improve the standard of worship . This led to a renewed interest in liturgical form .It is this period that was one of some disappointment to Bishop Charles Wordsworth ; Dr Milligan's Croall Lectures of 1879-80 revived his hopes and the close association that followed bore much fruit .In 1882 Dr Milligan's address to the Assembly dealt in part with the necessity of including the Scottish Episcopal Church in any negotiations for union .He asked " on what ground can you exclude them ? " .The only possible answer was " The Scottish Episcopalians will exclude themselves for they will concede nothing " ( Moderator's Address of Professor Milligan 1882 vide C.Q.R. vol. LXVIII p 170 ) .

In the following years the Church of Scotland

was once again confronted with grave domestic issues involving the threat of disestablishment and naturally the prospect of a Presbyterian re-union dominated the ecclesiastical scene .However , the Scottish Church Society was formed in 1892 with Dr Milligan as its first President . Among the special objects of its constitution was " the deepening of a penitential sense of the sin and peril of schism " and " the furtherance of Catholic unity in every way consistent with true loyalty to the Church of Scotland" ( C.Q.R. ibid p 170 ;Cooper : Reunion A Voice From Scotland p 97 and Appendix II ) .Among its many supporters were men of distinction : Dr Hutchinson ,Dr A.K.H.Boyd ,Dr Leishman, John Macleod and Dr Sprott .Its influence upon the prospect of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation was considerable ( C.Q.R. ibid pp171 & 378-9 ) .Perhaps the society that has done most in the field of Presbyterian -Episcopal relations is the Scottish Christian Unity Association founded in Jan. 1904 by the Primus of the Episcopal Church ,Bishop Wilkinson who was also Charles Wordsworth 's successor in the see of St Andrews ( Slosser Church Unity op cit p 272 ) . Typical of the association's contribution are the studies circulated in its Historical Papers ( Historical Papers submitted toThe Christian Unity Association of Scotland by

its Special Committee 1911-13 .Privately printed 1914 ).The chief stated aim of the association is unity , not union,and it makes no claim to official or public representation.A committee of twenty-four manages its affairs and of these four are Episcopalians ( Slosser Christian Unity pp 272 ; Five Lambeth Conferences pp 433-34 ) .

Characteristic of the interest now engendered by the foregoing movements were the visits of such representative anglicans as Bishop Gore to New College ,Edinburgh and the Bishop of Salisbury to Perth and Aberdeen ( Bishop of Salisbury -'s Murtle Lecture , Aberdeen ; The Bearing of the Study of Church History on Some Problems of Reunion 1902 ) .In Oct . 1901 the Church Congress held in Aberdeen was concerned with the problem of Church Unity in Scotland and its wider issues . No practical steps resulted although Canon Rollo' s suggestion for a simple catechism was agreed to by the Presbyterians , Episcopalians ,Wesleyans and Congregationalists ( Official Report , Edinburgh Black wood 1903 : An Appeal Etc Glasgow Holmes 1903 ) . Meanwhile on Bishop Wilkinson's suggestion deputations from the principal churches waited on the Episcopal Synod and the General Assemblies of the Established and of the United Free Churches to ask for the appointment of a

Day of Intercession for Unity .They were warmly received on every hand and the request granted ( C.Q.R. ibid p 171 ) .

In May 1907 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland , led by Dr Archibald Scott , agreed to approach the United Free Church offering a free and unrestricted union .This was opposed by Dr James Cooper as in reality being a "restricted " union as it omitted the Episcopal Church from the scheme ( Cooper op cit p 78 ; C.Q.R. ibid p 172 ) .The overture proposed by Dr Cooper advocating the wider basis for discussions was defeated in the Assembly mainly through the efforts of Professor Paterson who argued that in 1661 the precedents of 1610 had been overturned and that the Episcopal Church would not now recognise the orders of the Church of Scotland ( Assembly Papers 1907 - Layman's Book of the General Assembly 1907 p90; Church Quarterly Review vol.LXVIII p I 73 ; Cooper op cit p 78) .

On April 24 th 1908 The Archbishop of Melbourne visited Scotland and explained the steps taken in Australia to further Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation there ( Slosser Christian Unity p 342 ) .Some correspondence took place between Dr Theodore Marshall , the Moderator -Designate of the 1908 Assembly and the Archbishop about the matter with a view to the fact that the question of re-union was shortly to be discussed at the ensuing Lambeth Conference .With this also in mind Dr Marshall devoted his Address to the Assembly to a



statement of the policy of the Church of Scotland in the matter of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .That policy may be summarised thus :

1. It would be impossible for the Church of Scotland to contemplate a union on the basis of " either all its ministers , or at any rate those called to rule in the united Church, being compelled practically to disown their ordination and accept ordination of a prelate"
2. The ordering of public worship " could be adjusted with comparatively little difficulty"
3. " I believe the doctrine of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches to be practically identical " .
- 4 . " If , however , union is to be sought with the Anglican Church itself as a means of strengthening ( I do not use the expression in any controversial sense ) national religion in this country by having one strong Imperial Church , which naturally might take , in , many ways , the form of the National Church of the largest part of the kingdom , the

question is entirely different .The union of Presbyterianism with Episcopacy ..... if it could be accomplished on a basis satisfactory to both , and without violating any essential principle of either , would be itself an enormous advantage , and both Churches would find they had much to learn in many ways from each other " ( C.Q.R. ibid pp I74 -5 ) .

. A few months later the Lambeth Conference , in the July of 1908 adopted the Resolution No 75 stating :  
That in the welcome event of any project of union between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-Episcopal Church , which , while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity , has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation , it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610 .Further , in the opinion of the Conference it might be possible to authorise arrangements ( for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordinations ) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders , without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of

Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer " ( Official Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 S.P.C.K. p 169 ff ; Slosser op cit pp 325-6 ; cf Canon Erskine Hill -Prospects of Reunion ,Glasgow 1908 for views on Transition Period and Tender Consciences from address at the Pan Anglican Conference ) . The

Bishop of Salisbury ,Dr John Wordsworth , was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Reunion and Intercommunion problems .This Committee concluded that from among the non-episcopal Churches , the Presbyterian Churches , present the most hopeful prospect for negotiations with a view to entrance into closer relations : " They find that the Presbyterians themselves declare that there is no especially strong desire on their part to enter into union with the Anglican Churches , except possibly for the desire existing among the Presbyterians of Australia " ( Slosser Christian Unity p 325 ) .The fact that the Australian proposals came to an unsuccessful termination on the question of re-ordination of Presbyterian ministers was most unfortunate in view of the prevailing spirit .

Dr James Cooper , Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow and Moderator of the General Assembly in 1917 did much to further attempts at accommodation and in a real sense did for the Church of Scotland what Bishop Wordsworth had done for the Episcopal Church .In 1909 he put

forward a suggestion for accommodation which is perhaps characteristic of the " episcopal " party in the Church of Scotland :

#### A. Doctrine and Standards

- I. First three articles of 1888 Lambeth Quadrilateral common to both churches .
2. Suggested re-statement of Thirty -Nine Articles and Westminster Confession .

#### B. Worship

Presbyterian Churches to legalise for all the Book of Common Prayer .All congregations now using it to continue doing so .On the other hand the Episcopal Churches not to force the Liturgy on Scottish congregations unaccustomed to its use as suggested in the Lee-Rorison Accommodation of 1864 .

#### C. Government

- I. The 1610 precedent might be " accepted now " by the Scottish Presbyterian Churches " on its own merits as a good thing , as a very ancient method of government ,and for the sake of unity , without raising any question of its Divine and imperative authority " .
2. With the Episcopate should be combined all the Presbyterian Church Courts .All these existed during

the episcopates of 1610 -38 ; the three lower courts during the 1661 -1690 episcopate .

3 . Increased number of synods .

4. Canonically consecrated bishops to be permanent moderators of each Synod with duty of visiting and superintendency of charges , seeing that ( not his arbitrary will but ) the law of the Church was obeyed by ministers and elders .If his fatherly advice was not taken he was to report the defaulter in the first instance to his presbytery .

5 .Let him " assume " the presbyters of the presbytery of the bounds to lay on hands along with him at every ordination of a presbyter .

6 . Let all the Bishops be members of each General Assembly .Let one of them be chosen Moderator of the year , as in the old National Councils of the Scottish Church one of the bishops was chosen Conservator .

7 . Let the Bishops be subject individually to the General Assembly ; but let the Assembly have no power to abolish ( as it did in 1638 ) the estate of bishops.

Amongst the benefits such an accommodation would give to the Presbyterians Dr Cooper lists : 1. A proper executive ; 2 An

efficient supervision of the clergy ; 3 A visible embodiment , in every great city and in every province , of the truth that our people , though in many congregations , yet constitute a single Church ; For the Scottish Episcopalians it would give " their devoted clergy fellowship with the vast body of the Scottish people , and an opportunity of benefitting large numbers by their spiritual gifts " .For the Church of England such an arrangement would promote the process of reconciliation with the nonconformists .Finally " It would enable both National Churches to cope more worthily with the enormous spiritual responsibilities of an united Empire .It would give an impulse to the cause of reunion throughout the whole of Christendom" ( The Problem of Reunion in Scotland - Church quarterly Review vol. LXVIII April 1909 pp 179-81 ) .

Prof Cooper continued to advocate such an accommodation during the next decade.His addresses delivered at King's College , London and in St Faith's Chapel , St Paul's Cathedral , in the Feb. and April of 1918 made a great impression ( J.Cooper -Reunion A Voice from Scotland -London Robert Scott 1918 ; vide also Principal Whyte 's Letter to the Scotsman Nov. 10 th 1911 ) .

On March of the same year , 1918 , an Informal Conference was held in Aberdeen " by Representatives of the Church of Scotland , the United Free Church of Scotland and

Scottish Episcopal Church , and suggested as a basis for similar conferences throughout Scotland " . The opening sentences of the proposals state " In view of the great urgency of the question of reunion , and the widespread and growing desire for some large reconstruction on an inclusive plan and the certainty that old antagonisms will be greatly diminished in perspective after the great war is over , it would seem that nothing but good could come from purely private and tentative conferences between friends of the Presbyterian and Anglican Churches in Scotland to see if a satisfactory basis of negotiations can be found .

There has been in the past a certain nervous shrinking on both sides lest anything should be done which might seem to involve either breach of principle or loss of self-respect , or lest the prospects of a still wider union should be compromised .

Again there has unquestionably been a real fear , amounting in many to a conviction , that mutual approach would only bring us to the opposite sides of an impassable gulf .

All this would suggest that before negotiations are possible , private and informal conferences should take place .

Such conferences might consider how far it would be possible to agree on a common ideal of what a re-united

Scottish Church of the future might be like " .

The main points of the suggested accommodation were as follows :

1. A period of preparation would be necessary before actual incorporating union could take place and during this time of approximation the two Churches would have to be separate and self-contained though now regarding each other with ever increasing friendliness and mutual recognition .
2. This period might begin at a definite date on which the Episcopal Church might adopt the system of Church Courts from Kirk Session to General Assembly while permanent Moderators of Presbyterian Synods might receive consecration as Bishops.
- 3 . Such a step towards a final incorporating union might surely be taken without sacrifice on either side of principle or self-respect. It seems to meet the main difficulty that on the one hand presbyterians must not be asked or expected to take any action which would express or imply any doubt of the sufficiency of



their own Orders .As their Moderator -Bishops would unquestionably treat as of exactly the same ecclesiastical status those ordained by the Presbytery alone and those on whom they themselves , with the Presbytery had laid their hands , they would - so far from implying doubt in the validity of Presbyterian ordination - be vigorously , manifestly and constantly asserting its complete sufficiency On the other hand , such a solution would not demand of the Episcopal Church that it should make intolerable the position of those members of her Communion who have genuine doubts whether any except Bishops have ever the right to ordain .

4. It will be recognised that while the Anglican Communion has never condemned the validity of Presbyterian ordination , and while many of her Bishops, Priests , and Laymen have regarded it as perfectly valid though irregular , yet on the other hand its sudden adoption after at least 1400 years of exclusively Episcopal Ordination could hardly fail to awaken in others a not

unreasonable measure of questioning. It is perhaps equally impossible that a unanimous finding on the matter will ever be reached as that a doubt on the subject will ever disappear .

5 . If in future ordinations Moderator -Bishops and Presbyteries joined in laying on of hands nothing , from the Presbyterian view , would be lost which is present now .The Moderator of Synod would simply be a presbyter solemnly consecrated to be the leader and spokesman of each Presbytery of the bounds .If in the intervening period before complete union the whole Presbyterian Church plainly and effectively asserted the precisely equal status of those who had been ordained after the appointment of Moderator -Bishops , and if after the union the question will have ceased to exist , it would not seem worth while to raise it in an acute form at all .

6. During the period of Preparation the relationship of the two Churches would be as follows : " They would both hold the Nicene faith , and in both the Sacraments would be liturgically celebrated , in both there would be full freedom to conduct other services on customary lines .

From the beginning of the Period there would , we should hope , be the fullest licence given by the authority on either side for such exchange of preaching as might be desired , while each Church would freely admit to the participation of its Sacraments those who were in full membership of the sister Church .

Time, good will , and mutual understanding would create an atmosphere in which prejudices, resentments , and suspicions would quietly die out , and at the close of the period the two Communion s would bring their long separation to a close and be merged in one reunited Scottish Church " .

The memorandum whilst appealing to the Episcopal Church :  
 " might not the Scottish Episcopal Church recognising the strong hold which the complete system of Presbyterian Church Courts has on the Scottish people , as well as its many intrinsic advantages agree to its inclusion in the future united Church ? " On the other hand might not " Presbyterians , knowing the importance the other side attach to the " historic Episcopate " and remembering that Andrew Melville's objection to Bishops was a later development in their own communion , be willing to give to it its corresponding place ? "  
 ( James Cooper op cit pp101-7 ; Slosser , Church Unity p340 ) .

The " Period of Preparation " envisaged in the Aberdeen Accommodation is an interesting one and is a most useful

contribution to the problem of transition which must of necessity be involved in any attempt at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation .

By the end of the Great War the world and its problems had assumed new proportions .The Empire and the United States had been brought into closer relationships by the common effort .The strength of the Dominions had been gloriously demonstrated .With the amazing improvement in world communications the great centres of Anglo-Saxon culture had been brought very near .The age of universalism had begun with Versailles and Geneva its first symbols .Of necessity these trends had their effect upon the problems of Church Unity .By the time of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation had become a matter of oecumenical rather than provincial concern . However , Dr Randall Davidson, as Archbishop of Canterbury and great Scotsman , visited the General Assembly in June 1921 to explain the Lambeth Appeal. Dr Wallace Williamson caused something of a sensation by publicly asking the Archbishop if he would preach in St Giles .In other words would the Archbishop get down to practical realities ; how far would the Anglican approach go to break down the prevailing isolation between the two communions .This challenge caused some indignation to DrCooper

and his party but no doubt Dr Williamson represented the generality of the establishment . Dr Davidson personally would perhaps have gone far to secure the practical implementation of the Appeal but he had to reckon with an increasing opposition within his own Church which had allied itself with the intransigent policy of the Scottish Episcopalians ( G.K.A.Bell -Randall Davidson -Lond . 1935 vol. 2 pp 1051-2 ) .He again visited the Assembly at the Union of 1929 ; he was eighty-one and in the evening of his life pleaded passionately with his fellow-countrymen for the cause of unity . ( op cit Vol. 2 p1374-5 ) . His successor , Dr Cosmo Gordon Lang , visited the Assembly in 1932 in the same cause . For the first time in the history of the Church of England its primatial throne was occupied by the son of the Scottish Manse ; this distinction was three years followed by another for in 1935 the Archbishop's brother , Dr Marshall B. Lang was elected to the Moderatorial Chair . The visit of 1932 was hardly successful ( Charles L.Warr The Presbyterian Tradition lond.1935 pp365 -6 ) .It was never quite clear whether the Archbishop was appearing officially or not .Some resented his visit as being " without the official invitation of the Supreme Court of the Church " ( Warr op cit p 366 ) . Accordingly it was agreed , not with any great enthusiasm to

to appoint representatives to negotiate with representatives of the Anglican communion .The Report of the Assembly's Commissioners presented to the Assembly in 1933 led to a decision that in future the Commissioners should negotiate only on a basis of mutual recognition of each other's ministry ( vide Warr op cit p 367 ) .Further " As regards this finding of the Assembly ,the minority maintain that in negotiation the statesmanlike course is to work toward compromise and not to issue defiant challenge at the outset " ( ibid p 368; G.K.A. Bell ,Documents ,1948 p.131 ).

The rapid growth of the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches in the Dominions and the U.S.A. raised further problems .The branches of the Church in these great lands were conscious of the perils of independent action in matters of Faith and Order . For the Anglicans , the Lambeth Conferences solved the difficulty by centralisation of thought and experience .If due regard was to be paid to the welfare of the whole Church no steps in matters of Faith and Order could be taken without reference to the consensus ecclesiae .In regard to the attempts at Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in Scotland this was especially true . Thus by 1920 we may assert that the great modern oecumenical attempts at Church Unity were begun in earnest .The long period of experience in attempting to resolve Presbyterian -Episcopal relationships in Scotland has had its honoured place in the oecumenical councils of this century .It is to the application

of this experience that we now address ourselves in the course of this inquiry .It is essential that we keep in mind the fact that no matter of doctrine ~~separates~~ the great Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches .It is not one of government ( Report of the Commission on Approaches to Unity To the General Convention ; Cleveland Ohio 1943 p 6 ) .It is essentially one of Orders ; whether Episcopacy is the esse or bene esse or in Forbes' phrase the " melius esse " of the Church ( Church Unity Papers I9II-I3 p I82 ) .

If we have shown that there have been those within the Episcopal Church itself who have held diverse opinions about this matter,we can only be conscious that liberal interpretations of this crucial tenet will not be out of place in the re-united Church .

## CHAPTER II

---

### THE ERA OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCES.



The Lambeth Conferences , the first of which was held on Sept. 22 nd 1867 had from the first an especial concern not only the unity of the Anglican Communion but also the wider union of all Christendom ( Slosser op cit pp230-232).As the former aim was brought nearer to realisation the latter became a predominant issue .

The first Conference , therefore whilst promulgating its concern over the divided condition of the universal Church expressing " the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world , ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord : ' That all may be one as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee , that they may also be one in us , that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me ' made more definite pronouncements in respect to domestic unity( Rt.Rev. Randall T.Davidson The Lambeth Conferences of 1867 , 1878 and 1888 - 1896 edit. pp 14 and 83 ) .

The Second Lambeth Conference of 1878 had as its primary object of discussion " The best mode of maintaining Union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion " ( Miss Honor Thomas The Five Lambeth Conferences -Lond. p82ff) The wider unity , was however , not neglected ( Davidson op cit pp169-170 ) .

The Third Lambeth Conference of 1888 has become notable for the concern it expressed for the wider unity of the Church. This was in no small measure due to the action of the General Convention of the American Protestant Episcopal Church held in 1886 at Chicago .The House of Bishops presented a historic report which they felt represented the essential basis for re-union :

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament , as the revealed Word of God .
2. The Nicene Creed , as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith .
3. The two Sacraments - Baptism and the Supper of the Lord - administered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution , and the elements ordained by Him .
4. The Historic Episcopate , locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church ."

Inviting other Christian bodies to initiate discussions on this basis the Convention experienced a poor response .Only the Northern Presbyterians accepted the invitation ( The Lambeth Conferences of 1867 etc op cit pp 331-334 ) .Negotiat-

ions broke down over the question of the validity of Presbyterian Orders ( Slosser op cit p 337 ) .The influence of the Chicago Convention upon the 1888 Conference was considerable and especially obvious in Resolution II expressing the Lambeth Quadrilateral :

#### Resolution II

" That , in the opinion of this Conference , the following Articles supply a basis on which approval may be by God's blessing made towards Home Re-union :

A. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments , as containing all things necessary to salvation , and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith .

B. The Apostle's Creed , as the Baptismal Symbol and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith .

C. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself - Baptism and the Supper of the Lord - ministered with unfailing use of Christ's Words of

Institution , and of the elements ordained by Him .

D. The Historic Episcopate , locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church " ( The Lambeth Conferences op cit . pp 280-I ) .

In the following resolution the Conference requests the various branches of the Anglican Communion to make it known that " they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference ( such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America ) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English - speaking races , in order to consider what steps can be taken , either towards corporate Re-union , or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter " ( ibid ) . Thus the Lambeth Conferences begin to adopt a more urgent concern for the unity of Christendom with each successive meeting ( vide Slosser op, cit . p 241 ) .

The Fourth Lambeth Conference of 1897 gave some consideration to the question of union with the Eastern and Latin Churches .In connection with the Bull Apostolicae Curiae

the Committee on Church Unity expressed approval of the omission of " spurious matter which previously rendered discussion hopeless " obviously alluding to the Nag 's Head Fable. The Pope had thus confined the criticism of the Anglican consecrations to the same principles on which Pope Clement in 1704 had pronounced the consecration of Bishop Gordon of the Scottish Episcopal Church as null , namely " Defect in form and intention " in the Ordinal ( Slosser op cit pp 209 , 242 ; F. Temple and W.D. Maclagan , Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations -Longmans Lond. 1897 ;The Five Lambeth Conferences pp 246 -7 ) .Further , in respect of the quadrilateral they stated that " in America many of the Presbyterians were not unwilling to remember that their forefathers would have accepted the Episcopacy in England in 1660 had the laity been recognised as now in the American , the Irish , and certain other of the Colonial Churches " ( Slosser op cit p 242 ) .We have shown in the course of this inquiry the contribution made by the accommodations of Leighton and Ussher .The former especially demonstrated the possible harmony of episcopal government with Presbyterian polity securing full representation for the laity .The modern exponents of such a harmony have not been unaffected by these pioneers in the same field .The very failure of the Restoration Episcopate in Scotland has been a

salutary warning , well heeded by the recent constitutions of the Scotch , Welsh , Irish and Colonial branches of the Anglican Communion .If , for instance , the Enabling Act has in large measure granted such representation to the Mother Church whose Assembly is fast becoming the predominant Court of the Church ; it has made the possibility of union with the Church of Scotland and other of the Free Churches less remote .Here perhaps we can trace the first fruits of Leighton's contribution which in his time seemed so barren of results .

The Lambeth Conference of 1908 as has already been noted made full use of the 1610 precedent.The influence of affairs in Scotland upon Resolution 75 was not inconsiderable: the visit of the Archbishop of Melbourne to Ayr and the work of Dr James Cooper appear to have had much effect ( H.J. Wotherspoon James Cooper Lond. 1926 p253 & p255 ; Report of the Scottish Church Society 19078 for text of the Archbishop of Melbourne's sermon preached at Holy Trinity , Ayr ) .As the acknowledged leader of the " episcopal party " within the Church of Scotland Dr Cooper expressed sanguine hopes of a settlement based on the 1610 precedent .Writing on Sept 16 th 1908 he could say " ..... the Lambeth Conference has removed the only serious difficulty in the way of reunion ".Indeed the

the reception accorded him by the sister Church encouraged such optimism .In the April of 1909 he writes that at Bristol " after my address one asked how the Scottish Bishops regarded this movement ; Bishop replied "they were all anxious for it " ( H.J.Wotherspoon op cit p 255 & 257 ) .Two years later , however , a representative of the Scottish Episcopal Church could comment " For Scotland , the Lambeth Conference seemed to prefer the episcopal period beginning with 1610 ; but this is only in the matter of constitutional government .Yet a claim will be made that the precedent set in the consecrations of that year should govern the episcopate of union ; while the safe precedent is to be found in the consecrations as performed in Westminster Abbey by the English bishops on December 12 th , 1661 " ( T.Hannan " The Scottish Consecrations in London in 1610". The Church Quarterly Review No 142 Vol. LXXI Jan. 1911 ) . Dr Slosser states " The seeming sanction of the Precedent of 1610 as a method of introducing Episcopacy into Presbyterianism aroused opposition on the part of the Anglo-Catholics " Slosser op cit p 328 ) .Nevertheless the 1610 has had considerable influence upon the union movements initiated by the Lambeth Conference .

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 is distinguished for its historic promulgation " The Appeal to All Christian People " . This differed from the quadrilateral as offering a basis of

union inasmuch as instead of the " historic episcopate " there is used a new terminology : " A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit , but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body " .There is no thought of relegating the claims of the historic episcopate for in Section VII it is stated " May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry ? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate .On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace " Again ,Section VIII states : " We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences .To this end we, who send forth this appeal, would say that if the authorities of other Communion should desire , we are persuaded that terms of union , having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations as



having its place in the one family life ..... It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. In so acting, no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry " ( Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, London S.P.C.K. pp 133-6 ) .This plea for mutual recognition reflected in no small degree the triumph of Leighton's pacific spirit .Further, the Conference recommended that the proper authorities of other Churches should " formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their area to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour .... to restore the unity of the Church of Christ " .Thus " in view of the prospects and projects of re-union, a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorisation to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union ... to preach in Churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers ".No general scheme of intercommunion or pulpit exchange was recommended (ibid Resolutions 10 & 12 ) .As far as Scotland is concerned little has been done by the Episcopal Church to implement these resolutions although it is likely that the matter will shortly be given further consideration : at a meeting of the Consultative

Council on Church Legislation of the Episcopal Church in Scotland held in Edinburgh on Oct. 9 th 1947 " On the motion of Mr T.P. Spens the following matters which had been passed to the Bishops from various quarters for consideration by the Provincial Synod were referred to sub-committees -

I. Canons XVI and XVII -

a. Canon XVI ., section 2 - " That the terms of the Canon be modified in such a way as to permit ministers of non-episcopal communions to preach or speak in episcopal churches under certain specified conditions "

b. Canon XVII., section I ( and ref Canon XVI ), section 2 -" That the wording of the Canons be revised in such a way as to draw a distinction between 'other communions ' which are episcopal and those which are not " .

c. " That the right of episcopalian clergy to preach or take part in services in churches of other communions be recognised , but that conditions be specified regulating and limiting the use of this right " ( The Scottish Guardian Vol.XVII No 878 October 31 ,1947 ) .The Church of Scotland raises no objections to such exchanges .

In 1921 the Church of Scotland delivered a formal reply

to the " Appeal to All Christian People " .It expressed appreciation for the efforts that had been made to formulate a definite basis for unity but as in past attempts at accommodation , made it plain that they were unable to accept any scheme invalidating the Presbyterian ministry or exalting episcopacy as the esse of the Church ( G.K.A. Bell Documents of Christian Unity pp 29-155 ) .

The years 1921-25 form a distinctive period within the history of the cause of Christian Union .Following the " Appeal to All Christian People " consultations were held with representatives of the Free Churches but the bergschrund between the two conceptions of Orders remained apparently impassable. The 1925 Conference plainly set forth the Anglican view " the Anglican Church requires that no one can exercise his ministry in its own congregations who has not received episcopal ordination " . There is a suggestion that ( although non-episcopal ministeries are presumably valid ) they could easily be regularised by conditional episcopal ordination ( 2 nd Memorandum of the Anglican Representatives at the Joint Conference June 19 th 1925 -Bell Documents of Christian Unity 2 nd Series pp 80,81-4). It is with the real meaning of ordination sub conditione that workers in the field of Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation are much concerned ,Dr Kenneth Kirk as representing the school of uncompromising Anglicanism has suggested that the validity

of the non-episcopal ministries need not be questioned de facto but most certainly de jure ( Dr K.Kirk The Meaning of Validity The Apostolic Ministry p 45 ) .Whilst not by any means the official view it is probably the representative view at the present time.The idea of sub conditione ordination suggested in the Second Memorandum of 1925 is not repugnant to many in the Presbyterian communion as has happily been verified in the full support given to the South India Union by the Church of Scotland and in negotiations that have taken place in the United States , Canada and Australia . In reference to the South India Scheme we must note that there is no sub conditione ordination of the existing ministry in the strict sense but there is consecration for apostolic superintendency . The position of Sharp and Leighton in 1661 seem to indicate that they regarded their ordination as sub conditione ; the latter in a cumulative sense .It must be confessed that the Presbyterian position in respect to ordination is as confused as that held by the various schools of thought within the episcopal churches .An instance of this is the statement " The Church of Scotland ( unlike the United Free Church ) , has never accepted Methodist orders as valid for its own ministry but has always insisted on re-ordination . The only orders which it has ever accepted , in addition to Presbyterian, have been

Roman and Anglican .The sole exception has been the admission without re-ordination , between the years 1866 and 1882 , of five Congregational ministers , on the ground ,I understand , that they claimed with some measure of justification that they had carried on an unbroken and in an orderly manner the orders they received when they first separated themselves from the Church of Scotland .Since 1882 ,however ,this concession has been withdrawn " ( Rev. T.B.Thompson Article " Re-Ordination in the Church of Scotland " The Review of the Churches Vol .V No I Jan. 1928 p 18 ).Further Dr D.C.Macgregor, at one time Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England has maintained that in an emergency the minister might depute an elder to take his place as the celebrant of the Holy Communion ( vide The Apostolic Ministry note p 480 ) .In the Report of the 1948 Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Wales it has been stated " A rather sharp set of resolutions were directed towards the practice of unauthorised persons conducting the Sacrament.The chief offence appeared to be that students and lay preachers when engaged in service for other denominations administered the Lord's Supper".

The Moderator read the rules from the Book of Church Order which precluded any but ordained ministers undertaking

this duty , adding that from 1812 , ordination with them had been , not for preaching the word but for administering sacraments .

Disagreeing , a minister said that when a few Sundays ago his place had to be taken by a lay brother the congregation could not have the Communion service , although eleven experienced and devout elders sat in the church . Were they not going back on the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers ? When students went out for preaching engagements in , say , Congregational churches , and it was Communion Sunday , they must excuse themselves from the invitation to administer the Sacrament " ( The British Weekly No 3210 Vol.CXXIV -May 20 th 1948 p II ).

These views of the function and place of the ministry are typical of the tensions existing in this matter within the Presbyterian communion as a whole . Since the Union in Scotland it is possible that the views on Order held by the Church of Scotland have become more liberal . These divergent views have on the other hand been held by both communions in varying degrees since the Reformation period . It must be confessed , however , that the principle of Order has been faithfully observed by

the Church of Scotland whilst it has been the chief glory of the Episcopal Church ( vide Bishop K.D.Mackenzie The Case For Episcopacy 2 nd Edit 1929 S.P.C.K. p 120 for a discussion on the definition of "elder " .Is it to be translated "presbyter " or merely "senior " ; " A definite answer either way " says the Bishop " would make the Presbyterian system capable of coalescing with Catholicism " ) .

To the faithful of the Church of Scotland the few years prior to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 was a time of some perplexity .The Union of the two great Presbyterian Communion had been consummated and free from domestic concerns, under Dr Cooper's tuition,, they had learnt to look abroad .The scene that met their eyes was a British Parliament moved to tears over the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. It was soon clear that the rejection of the 1928 Prayer Book was of less import than its consequences .These were an unguarded freedom and the strengthening of those elements within the Church of England less likely to make concessions in the matter of accommodation .This , in turn , has had the effect of strengthening the uncompromising stand of the Scottish Episcopal Church whose last liberal bishop had passed from the scene many years before in the person of Dr Ewing . Thus the Lambeth Conference of 1930 seemed to many to lack the spirit which raised such hopes in 1920 ( Hugh Martin

Christian Reunion S.C.M. London 1941 p 83 ) .The Report of the Committee on the Unity of the Church stated that " The Historic episcopate as we understand it goes back behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the apostolic ministry .It is not a mere fact , but an institution fulfilling certain purposes .As an institution it was , and is , characterised by succession in two forms : the succession in office and the succession of consecration ..... What we uphold is the episcopate maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration , as it has been throughtout the history of the Church from the earliest times " ( Report p II5 ) .In the words of the Bishop of Oxford " ab initio sic non erat is a final judgement here " ( K.Kirk The Apostolic Ministry p 27 ) .On the other hand the Committee stated in their Report on the Unity of the Church : " We emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ~~ministries~~ now exercised in non-episcopal communions .On the contrary , we reiterate the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 , that ' these ~~ministries~~ have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace " ( Lambeth Conference Report ,1930 , pII6) .

The 1930 Conference was most certainly not unfruitful. Conversations were initiated issuing in the Outline of a Reun-



ion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England .The main elements of the Scheme may be summarised thus :

A. A Common Faith .

B. Acceptance of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper .

C. A form of church order comprehending episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements .

D. Freedom from State control in spiritual affairs .

( Martin op cit p 105 ) .

These indeed are the acknowledged elements of the re-united church . In the course of attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland the necessity of them has been proved in the crucible of fierce controversy .The lessons of bitter experience have not been forgotten ( vide Hugh Martin op cit pp167-8 ) .The chief glory of the 1930 Conference was the approval of the proposals for the scheme of Church Union in South India .The Scheme was completed in 1929 after ten year's work by a joint committee of the Anglican Church of India , Burma and Ceylon ,the South India United Church ( Congregational and Presbyterian ) and the Methodist Churches .These proposals we shall reserve for consideration but it will be important to note :

1. It would be the first union of episcopal and non-episcopal churches .
  2. The outline scheme for England follows the same general lines as that of South India on which it is in large measure based .The fortunes of any re-union scheme between the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Churches in Great Britain are bound up with the success or failure of the South India proposals .
  - 3 . The South India Scheme will effect proposals for union in an oecumenical sense .
  4. It is the great experiment which Leighton and his school wished to attempt .
- ( vide Christian Union in South India - W.J.Noble S.C.M. Press Lond . ) .

It is to be noted that the Scheme as approved by the Anglican Episcopate at the Lambeth Conference of 1930 considered it necessary that the proposed Church of South India would be outside the Anglican Communion during an interim period of " growing together " but that at the end of the interim period the proposed Church might be received into full communion with the Anglican Church ( The South India Church Scheme Report of the Archbishop's Committee -Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly London 1946 p 2 ).

The problems of transition are clearly fundamental and the interim envisaged by the Conference the first practical attempt

to meet these difficulties .We have seen an attempt to meet the problems of " a growing together " in the Aberdeen Accommodation of 1918 when a " Period of Preparation " was suggested .Much thought had been given to this both in Scotland and Lambeth .The solutions bear a striking similarity.

The Lambeth Conference of 1948 expressed its pleasure that the negotiations between the Anglican Church and the Church of Scotland suspended in 1934 on the occasion of Dr Fleming's " Wrecking Resolution " were likely to be renewed " in the near future " ( Lambeth Conference Report Lond. S.P.C.K. 1948 p 56 ) . In the section " Some Principles To Guide Further Progress " the observation is made : " The Ministry is , in our view , an organ of Christ in His Body and can only function healthily in the Body.None of us hold that tactual succession and correct formulae of ordination can guarantee a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set " ( ibid p. 63 ) .

This can be compared with a criticism of the Church of South India " But it remains true that form and manner alone are not sufficient to guarantee the character of a ministry . That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself " ( ibid p. 47 ) . It seems likely that the process of definition begun in 1930 is fast becoming a necessity for the Anglican Communion .If the irenical activity of the

present century is to continue Anglicanism must come to terms with itself .And not only Anglicanism; for the Churches of the Reformed tradition confronted with similar problems are seeking for their real foundations.Ultimately such activity will further not retard the process of unification .

## **CHAPTER 12**

---

### **THE OECUMENICAL MOVEMENT**

The oecumenical movement as Dr Bell has pointed out is not an international movement ; it is essentially a universal movement ( G.K.Bell Christianity and World Order Penguin Series 1941 p 118 ) .It is the visible result of supra -national forces seeking a spiritual unity within the Church universal; a striving after a Catholicity enriched , not impoverished by present divisions .The oecumenical movement is on the other hand obviously international because it is universal. Again , " The principal inspiration of this new movement for Christian unity would appear to have two sources ; youth , and the call of foreign missions " ( Bell op cit . p 113 ) .Thus it was that Dr John Mott of Cornell University founded at the age of thirty The World's Student Christian Federation .He was soon joined by such fellow workers as Nathan Soderblom ( Sweden ) ,Wilfred Monod ( France ) , Fr Siegmund - Schultze ( Germany ) and J.H.Oldham ( Great Britain ) .

The two sources of " the new movement looking towards the Universal Church " may be summarised thus :

I. Need for co-operative action between the Churches in a fellowship of service in the social , economic and international fields .This fellowship of service naturally appeals to students eager to serve their

generation .These activities may be placed under a group heading of the Life and Work Movement .

2. With the expansion of Christian missionary activities the need for a common witness in lands remote from the divided traditions of Western Christendom grows more urgent with each advancing year of the 20 th century .Thus the Faith and Order Movement seeks to find the answer to the question " Why the Churches engaged in bearing this united witness should have to do so as separate bodies divided on questions of faith and order , and aims at the removal of these obstacles to full and complete unity " ( vide Bell op cit . p 118 ) .

Six years after the institution of the Christian Unity Association of Scotland ,Edinburgh was the scene of the World Missionary Conference held in 1910 and termed by the historian of unity " the most significant missionary conference in modern Christendom " ( Slosser op cit p 253 ) . Dr John Mott ( he was a layman of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States ) was made Chairman of the Continuation Committee - a most necessary office in view of the profound effect the Conference had upon its delegates .Amongst these was one of the great Bishops of modern Christendom ,Charles H. Brent , of the American Episcopal

Church .As a result of this Conference he felt there must be further meetings of their representatives " who should thereby lead to a greater concensus in matters of Faith and Order " ( Slosser op cit p 352 ) .Accordingly on Oct 19 th 1910 the General Convention of the American Protestant Episcopal was asked to consider a resolution introduced by Dr Manning . later Bishop of New York , and supported by Bishop Brent " to take under advisement the promotion by this Church of a Conference following the general method of the World Missionary Conference , to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus as God and Saviour , for the consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ " ( Faith and Order Lausanne ,1927 ,edited by Canon H.N. Bate , Lond . 1927 Introduction p VII ) .The Committee appointed to consider the proposal reported " We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ , led by the Holy Spirit , may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order " ( Slosser op cit p 352 ) .Thus the Conferences on Faith and Order were born .The first Conference held at Lausanne in 1927 declared " This is a Conference summoned to consider matters of Faith and Order .It is emphatically not attempting to define the conditions of future reunion .Its object is to register the



apparent limited and fundamental agreement within the Conference and the grave points of disagreement remaining ; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement " ( Bate op cit pp387-459 ) .Accordingly the Faith and Order Movement has been defined as " an educational movement " ( Bell op cit . p II9 )- .The second conference was held at Edinburgh in 1937 .Dr W.Temple presided over delegates from 122 Christian communions who affirmed " We believe that every sincere attempt to co-operate in the concerns of the Kingdom of God draws the severed communions together in increasing mutual understanding and goodwill .We call upon our fellow -Christians of all communions to practise such co-operation ; to consider patiently occasions of disunion that they may be over-come ; to be ready to learn from those who differ from them ; to seek to remove those obstacles to the furtherance of the Gospel in the non-Christian world which arise from our divisions ; and constantly to pray for that unity which we believe to be our Lord's will for His Church " ( Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order 1937 p52) .

In the Lausanne Conference Lord Sands , Procurator of the Church of Scotland 1907-17 , made the interesting observation " The Church of Scotland to which I belong , is not a Lutheran or historically a Protestant Church , but it is a reformed Church " ( Faith and Order 1927 Report edited H.N.Bate 2 nd edit p 188 ) .This was

the position of those who like Dr Lee , Dr Sprott and Dr Cooper had striven manfully for a Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation during the latter half of the 19 th century .We have shown too that Dr Cooper's contribution owed much to that of John Forbes ( vide memoir by Prof Fulton in the Aberdeen University Review quoted H.J. Wotherspoon -James Cooper -London 1926 p348-9 ) .Dr Cooper passed away in the December of 1922 but he had attended the preliminary conference of the Faith and Order movement in Geneva during the August of 1920 ( Wotherspoon op cit p 323 ) .The truths underlying the statement of Lord Sands is indeed the contribution which those like Forbes ,Leighton and Cooper tried to bring to the question of wider union . The Presbyterian system in Scotland was a reformed polity yet demonstrated the possible preservation of catholicity .Of Dr Cooper it has been said , as could be said of John Forbes and Leighton " At the same time he was in his personal position a Presbyterian , holding the Presbyterate to be the fundamental and essential order of ministry , and justifying the action of the Church of Scotland by which , when the Episcopate failed it in 1560 , it fell back on the inherent function of the Presbyterate , and on that basis evolved for itself a practical application of the Catholic system - a course which in the circumstances he held within its right .He had no wish to see Episcopacy substituted in Scotland for Presbytery , any more than he had to return to the

policy of the National Covenant and to enforce Presbytery in England .He desired that the two systems should supplement each other in combination , the Scots Episcopalians adopting our series of Courts , while we obtained a new efficiency for our Courts by adopting their constitutional Episcopate .Something of the sort had existed from 1610 to 1638\* ( Wotherspoon op . cit . p 340 ) . Thus in matters of Faith and Order attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland had demonstrated that Presbyterianism was " the natural link and mediator between the Episcopal and non-Episcopal Communion of the Reformation .But of Presbyterians the Church of Scotland by its history and by its national status held a certain position of influence , if not of leadership , and was perhaps more than any other , representative of Presbyterianism as originally conceived , and as stated for example in the Second Helvetic Confession and by British divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries .The Church of Scotland then might seem to be the key of the position and the pivot on which any hope of Catholic reunion must turn " ( Wotherspoon op. cit. p 339 )

If the practicability of attempts at Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in modern movements be at all doubted there can be no doubt of its actual existence .Dr Josef Soucek, Senior and President of the Evangelical Church of Bohemia

( Czech Brethren ) pointed out at Lausanne " But it seems that it is impossible for some Churches to recognise the ministers of other Churches , and that perhaps the solution of the difficulty might be a constitutional episcopate . I believe - and I speak personally - that this suggestion need not be a priori rejected by non-episcopal Churches , and that for two reasons : there are Churches which we cannot consider episcopal in the full sense of that term , but they have bishops . There are Methodist bishops , Lutheran bishops and also Presbyterian bishops , and we have with us at this Conference two such Presbyterian bishops . I know that they and their Church are decidedly Presbyterian ; they have changed the name " superintendent " to " bishop " , and many other Reformed Churches with the Presbyterian system have or have had superintendents . Comenius in one of his writings defends the title of bishop as a Biblical name . And if that is possible in some non-episcopal Churches , why not in others , if by such a concession Church unity could be achieved ? " ( Bate Lausanne Report 2 edit . 1927 p 272 ) . Perhaps we may re-iterate the considered opinion of Dr J.L.Ainslie that the Superintendents of the Knoxian era were not bishops in any sense of the term but that " it looks as if they might possibly have developed along lines which would have infringed the principle of ministerial equality " ( J.L.Ainslie The Doctrine

-s of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16 th and 17 th Centuries Edin . 1940 pp109-112 ) . We have suggested that the era of superintendency might well have been the first stage in the recapitulation of the evolution of a constitutional episcopate .As such , Dr Soucek points out , the significance of a superintendency in the process of reunion .Clearly the superintendency of the early reformed Church in Scotland may well be considered as having some bearing on the relations between the episcopal and non-episcopal churches especially in view of its suggested re-adoption by the Church of Scotland ;and in view of its adoption by the Congregational and Baptist Churches in England .

In May 1929 a Committee appointed by the General Assembly presented a report of the Lausanne ( 1927 ) Proceedings which stated that " There may be room for variations , whether local or sectional , in the form of the rite of ordination .But so long as to any section of the Church any one " element " is a matter of faith and doctrine essential to valid ordination , that " element " must be present in the system of ordination which is to provide a universally recognised ministry .

According to the standards of the Church of

Scotland , the grace of ordination is transmitted to those who are called by the Holy Ghost to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments by the laying on of the hands of ministers who have been similarly ordained , lawfully associated together for this solemn purpose .But whilst there can be no departure from that position , the suggestion of the incorporation of other "elements " to satisfy the convictions of those who deem them essential as a necessary condition in the provision of a universally recognised ministry is a suggestion which cannot be negatived without fuller study in the light of more specific proposals " ( Convictions - A Selection From the Responses of the Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order ,Held at Lausanne in 1927 - edited by L.Hodgson -London S.C.M. 1st edit 1934 p88 ) . In a similar report the Presbyterian Church in Wales stated that " ...it does not consider that any one of these matters is essential , because it does not believe that one particular form of ministry is divinely instituted and is for that reason immutable .Rather are we of opinion that the history of the Church proves that under the guidance of the Spirit different arrangements were entrusted to the wisdom of the Church as we see in the Episcopal , Presbyterian and the Congregational Churches ; and moreover , believe that we should again trust to the wisdom and spiritual sense of the United Church to order

its ministry " ( Hodgson op cit p 93 ) . The Presbyterian Church of the United States reported " It is difficult to see how the Presbyterian Church can enter into union with Churches which regard as essential the acceptance of the Episcopacy as being historic in the sense that it can be traced directly back to the Apostles and as such *vis a vis* *qua non* of the Church of Jesus Christ , or is even necessary for its *bene esse* ..... We do not deprecate the importance of historic continuity , but we do not condition this upon the episcopal succession .We would not see any insuperable difficulty in the episcopate form of Church administration if viewed as involving no disparity of standing of bishop and presbyter and no denial of the validity of Presbyterian ordination " ( *ibid* p 81 ) .

The Reformed Church of the U.S.A. in its Report quotes an article written by the Rev. Herbert Symonds , Vicar of Christ Church Cathedral , Montreal in the Constructive Quarterly of December 1917 " Ever since the Reformation, Reformed Churches have tended steadily in the direction of democratic government .This is evident even in the Anglican Church , even in England , but in the United States and in the Dominions of the British Empire , the Anglican Church is a democracy with the elected bishop as the chief executive officer ..... It is no longer the case that the Anglican

communion is governed by bishops .They are the chief executive officers of a constitutional and democratic body " .The Report then comments " Doctrine and practice of the Churches cannot escape the modifying influences of democracy " ( ibid pp222-223) This is a profound truth and especially so in relation to the problems of accommodation in this modern age .

The Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order held in 1937 gave much encouragement to the Scheme for Church Union in South India .The Conference emphasised its importance for the Church Universal .It stated that the scheme " deserves particular attention and study because in it an attempt is being made to include within a united Church communions holding to the episcopal , the presbyteral and the congregational principles .The importance of prayerful study of this scheme is further shown by the fact that union negotiations based on its principles are in progress in other parts of the world " ( vide The World Mission of the Church ,Tambaram 1938 Report Lond . International Missionary Council p 154 ) .

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm in August 1925 was " the first oecumenical conference of Churches in modern history " ( Bell Christianity and World Order op cit p 122 ) .No representatives of the Roman Church were present . The letter of invitation stated:



" The World's need is so urgent , and the demand for common action on the part of all Christians so insistent at this juncture , that we cannot afford to await the fulfilment of that great hope of a reunited Christendom before putting our hearts and our hands into a united effort that God's will may be done on earth as it is in Heaven " ( Bell op cit p121 ; Bell Report -The Stockholm Conference Oxford Univ. Press ) .The aim of the Conference as defined by the preparatory Conference held at Zurich in 1923 was described :

" The Conference on Life and Work , without entering into questions of Faith and Order , aims to unite the different Churches in common practical work , to furnish the Christian conscience with an organ of expression in the midst of the great spiritual movements of our time , and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of the contemporary social and international problems " ( Slosser op cit p 294 ) .In the "Message " of the Conference the members stated " the world to be too strong for a divided Church , a lesson drawn from the World War ..... that they opposed both national bigotry and weak cosmopolitanism ...".

Thus the Life and Work Movement showed one way of promoting unity was a federated service in Christ's name ( Slosser op. cit . pp 294-5 ) .Again , " the Christian Church at Stockholm in 1927 considered the challenge of " the recrudescence of

nationalism following the World War and in connection with Christian Unity Movements in the Christian fields " ( Slosser op cit p 365 ) .In the course of this inquiry we have shown the very important part played by the problems of nationalism in attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland .The Lausanne Conference found that national traditions and psychological characteristics were factors compelling any scheme of universal Christian unity to be comprehensive, not rigid or uniform ( Slosser op. cit . p 365 ) .In the words of Dr A.E. Garvie " Uniformity is not necessary for unity , for it has again and again when enforced provoked conflict and discord .Within the limits which the truth and the grace of Christ set, variety of creed , code , ritual and polity , must be allowed , in recognition of the variety of human thought and life " ( Lausanne 1927 Report 2 nd Edit . p 504 ; see also Report of the Oxford Conference 1937 p 31 ) . The attempts to meet these problems made in the long history of the Church in Scotland have helpful significance for those working for unity in this present urgent age .To the carnal eye surveying the melancholy events of the late 16th and 17 th century in Scotland the picture is dark and stormy , rent with the lightning of dissension .In the light of the oecumenical movement ,however , the eye of the spirit cannot

but realise that these things were for our admonition .The second Life and Work Conference met at Oxford in July 1937 being a month previous to that at Edinburgh.It met indeed at a time of crisis .With the rise of totalitarianism and the growing secularisation of community life the Conference felt constrained to discuss the problems of Church ,Community and State .There was no official German delegation as the German government had forbidden its attendance ( vide Appendix A The Churches Survey Their Task ,The Report of the Conference at Oxford ,July 1937 , On Church ,Community and State Lond. 1937 ) .Once again we can claim that the attempts made to effect Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland have especial significance in the elucidation of these problems.Melville had witnessed to the ~~overruling~~ Lordship of Christ .If the King was a " silly vassal " his people were the heirs of a greater kingdom .Thus confronted with the same dilemma the Conference affirmed " The distinctive character of the Church's activity is the free operation of grace and love .The distinctive character of the State's activity , whatever its constructive function in the cultural and social life may be , is the power of constraint , legal and physical .In consequence there are certain social activities which clearly belong to the State ; there , are however , still others which may be performed by either Church or State.

In this area tension is unavoidable and solutions will vary in varying historical circumstances. It is true that our Lord told his disciples to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's . But it is God who declares what is Caesar's . Therefore , whatever the choice may be , the Christian must always , whether as a member of the Church or as a citizen , obey the will of God " ( Report op. cit . p 82 ) . In a later report on The Problem of Personal Compromise it was stated " Through all the Christian centuries there have been within the Life and leadership of the Church representatives of each of the two main alternative positions whom their fellows and the judgement of subsequent generations have recognised as true and devoted followers of Christ . The distinction between the ' sect ' and the ' church ' types of practical Christianity appears clearly in the earliest records of the primitive Church itself , and it corresponds in some measure with the distinction of prophet and priest in the ministry of the Church . The stubborn persistence and constant recurrence of these two views of the Christian Life and types of Christian fellowship and worship suggest that both have their necessary place within the wider reality of Christ's Church " . The Report continues : " Man's natural attraction is to conformity ; there is an inherent lag and

drag in human nature which is part of man's sinfulness .Therefore every man must be warned unremittingly of this incurable tendency and be put on his guard against it . Further , it is the prophets who pioneer mankind's advance- almost always at the price of misunderstanding and abuse , often at the cost of persecution and martyrdom .The blood of the martyrs is the life of the Church .Therefore the Church and every Christian owe a special duty of sympathy and support to fearless and devoted pioneers " ( Report pp215-6) .The great efforts for accommodation in Scotland did indeed exemplify the truth that only by loyalty to a common redeemer , however that loyalty be interpreted , could the saints and martyrs of the Presbyterian and Episcopal Communions preserve their gift for the treasury of the re -united Church .Truly only a superficial judgement would regard the many attempts at accommodation in Scotland as being a negative process .

The Faith and Order Movements and that of Life and Work agreed in 1937 that their functions would be carried on by the World Council of Churches .

The Christian Youth movements found their first great oecumenical expression in the Amsterdam Conference held on July 24 th 1939 on the very eve of the Second World War . Whilst considering the results of the Oxford and Edin-

burgh Conferences as a basis for immediate action the chief feature of the assembly was the experiment in worship . It was a new feature of the oecumenical movement ( Bell - Christianity and World Order op cit pp 126-7 ) .Previously the services of the conferences had been undenominational in character , which tended to separate , rather than unite those of various communions .At Amsterdam the worship was carefully arranged according to a plan in which the Orthodox rite , the Anglican rite , the Lutheran and Reformed rite each had separate services in which the Conference was asked to share as far as the Church discipline of each member permitted .The experiment proved to be a memorable experience of both the unity and diversity of worship within the universal church. Dr Bell comments : "Here was a real oecumenism in worship , and with it came a grander vision of unity with variety and a more urgent longing to see the unity more completely expressed to the world " ( Bell Christianity and World Order p 127 ) .It is well that the future leaders of the oecumenical movement should have seen this vision .The supreme comprehension will be inclusive not exclusive ; unity not uniformity .This has become a truism now .We need to be reminded of those who in the 1610 accommodation and those of the second episcopal period in 1661 who strove for a working basis for the

episcopate within a presbyterian system and with the blending of order and liberty in the expression of a common worship .The Laudian attempts at uniformity in worship evoked division and ultimate disunion .The significance of this for modern movements of unity is obvious .It is interesting to note in this connection Dr Fisher's speech of March 27 th 1946 to the Free Church Federal Council " when we come together we become again the Church of England .But now you would come into it with the traditions which you have developed in the period of dislocation , with your own customs , your own methods , and your own style of pulpit oratory .You have also your own hymn tunes and other things that matter in your daily life .

Will all these things have to disappear in a reunited Church ? I should say Heavens forbid .Should the Free Churches lose all power of self direction and identity with the past ? Heaven forbid .I look forward to a time when ,the Church of England having been reunited with the Methodists , Congregationalists , the Baptists and the presbyterians will, within that reunited Church , still function with an identity of their own " (The Times , March 28 th , 1946 ) .

The Second World Conference of Christian Youth took place at Oslo in July 1947 and inspite of the catastrophic events of the intervening years maintained the

buoyant hopefulness of Amsterdam .

Speaking at the Oxford Conference of 1937 a distinguished Chinese Christian, Dr Timothy Lew, said "If it had not been for the missionary enterprise, these oecumenical movements would never have come into existence" ( vide Hugh Martin Christian Reunion p 84 ). Indeed the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, the Jerusalem Missionary Conference of 1928 and the Tambaram Conference of 1938 had a profound effect upon re-union movements. Each succeeding decade of this present century has made the younger churches more impatient with the divisions that are alien and hindering. Typical of this outlook was the remark made by the late Bishop of Dornakal at the Lausanne Conference of 1927 " 'I am a Baptist', said an Indian friend to me, 'not because of theology, but because of geography.' " ( Report 1927 2 edit. p 493 ). To the younger churches denominations are occidental and accidental. The Reports of the Tambaram Conference, where the representatives of the younger Churches made up half a total delegation of 471 show the constant re-iteration of pleas for unity ( Article The Churchman vol. LXI No 3 Sept 1947 -R.W. Howard - Towards a United Church p 103 ; Hugh Martin op cit p 85 ) Prof. John Foster has given a timely reminder that " Knowledge of Church history is necessary equipment for any man who is concerned with the task of



Church Union .The Tambaram findings have made it clear that the first moves are likely to be in the hands of the younger churches " ( The Tambaram Series Oxon Univ Press vol.4 pp 270-I ) .Prof K.S. Latourette has stated " A knowledge of the history of Christianity is of quite first-class importance to leaders in the Church the world around .It is to be hoped that it will be of such a nature as to promote that catholicity of outlook and understanding and that comprehension of the continuing vitality of the Gospel which are of the genius of the faith " ( ibid p 275 ) . Attempts at Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in Scotland have much significance when viewed in this light .That its lessons have been learnt is perhaps patent upon any consideration of the South India Union Scheme which was strongly supported by the Tambaram Conference ( Report ibid pp408-22 ) . One important contribution of the Tambaram Conference was the stress laid on the need for conciliar action .In matters of joint planning and discipline " National Christian Councils and similar organisations have a most important part to play " ( Report ibid p 399 ) .During the course of the period under review we have seen the need that was felt by the Church of Scotland for corporate representation through the General Assembly; it was an obvious necessity .Any hope of unity failed when this vital aspiration was suppressed .

Before we close this brief account of the oecumenical movement mention should perhaps be made of the Kikuyu Controversy. A Conference held in Kikuyu on June 7<sup>th</sup> 1913 was the sixth of a series the first of which took place in 1908. The *raison d'être* of the meetings was "Islam is united and Christendom is divided" ( Roger Lloyd The Church of England in the Twentieth Century- Longmans London 1946 vol. I p 97 ; Slosser op. cit . pp 258-62). The denominations represented amongst others were the Church of England , the Church of Scotland , the United Methodists and the Lutherans .The Conference resolved unanimously " With a view to the ultimate union of the native Churches , a federation of missionary societies shall be formed .The basis of the federation shall consist in :

1. The loyal acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as supreme rule of faith and practice ; of the Apostles 'and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief ; and , in particular , belief in the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God ; in the Deity of Jesus Christ and in the atoning death of our Lord as the ground for our forgiveness .

2. Recognition of common membership between

the Churches in the federation .

3 . Regular administration of the two sacraments by outward signs .

4 . A Common form of Church organisation ( Slosser op. cit . p 259 ) .

It was also tentatively decided to formulate an expression of worship in a Book of Common Prayer and to draw up a plan for a division of territory . Ministers of other Churches were allowed to preach in Anglican pulpits but not to administer the sacraments .

The Conference closed with a united communion service when Bishop Peel of Mombasa was the celebrant . Frank Weston , Bishop of Zanzibar, as a consequence of this united act of fellowship , formally accused two of the participating bishops with heresy . Dr Davidson , then Archbishop of Canterbury, refused to sanction any trial of the case but endorsed the findings of the Consultative Body he had appointed which stated that whilst non-Anglicans may be allowed to communicate with Anglicans , the reverse was not allowed . The three-fold ministry alone is regular ; nothing was said about the validity or otherwise of the ministry of non-episcopal churches . In July 1918 the seventh Kikuyu Conference was when Bishop Weston was himself present . Proposals for an Alliance

were adopted( Eugene Stock -Kikuyu Rediviva Art .The Constructive quarterly ,Vol. VII No 26 June 1919 ) .The Bishop urged an accommodation on the lines of the Lambeth quadrilateral and assured the non-episcopalians that if they would consent to some form of Episcopal consecration or ordination so as to enable them to minister in Episcopal Churches when invited , he would gladly come before their Churches and accept any form of popular recognition .These proposals were not accepted .In 1923 the Kikuyu Conference of that year again made a strong plea for mutual ordination as a basis for a United Church in Kenya and Protectorate ( vide Kikuyu 1894 - 1923 Semi-Jubilee Book of the Church of Scotland Mission , Kenya Colony ) .

In some measure L'Affaire Kikuyu is an example of an isolated attempt to effect a unity in the mission field before the oecumenical movement arose to integrate such efforts .The difficulties Kikuyu encountered are still difficulties and best met with the support of a common encouragement .They are typical too of the problems any modern attempt at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation will have to meet .

## CHAPTER 13

---

### ATTEMPTS AT ACCOMMODATION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA .

Two hundred years ago Archbishop Wake had written of the reformed churches of the continent " Far be it from me that I should be so iron -hearted as to believe that on account of such a defect ( ' in order ' ) any of them should be cut off from communion with us ; or that with certain mad ( furiosis ) writers among us I should pronounce them to have not true and valid sacraments " ( Macclaine's Mosheim Vol.V Appendix II Edit . of 1768 ) .An historian of the American Protestant Episcopal Church has commented upon this " This seems to me to be the historic Anglican attitude - frank recognition of defects in the form and transmission of Protestant ministeries , coupled with a wise and charitable refusal to pronounce these ministeries invalid " ( P.V. Norwood ,Progress and Prospects in Christian Reunion , Halle Memorial , 1929 ,Milwaukee p 16 ) .Perhaps it would not be presumptuous to assume that this is the general attitude of the American Episcopal Church towards Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation ( vide The Guardian No 5346 May 28 th 1948 p 258 -Letter The Church in U.S.A. " Open Communion " ) .

As early as 1792 Bishop Madison of Virginia had introduced into the House of Bishops a resolution that the Episcopal Church be " ready and willing to unite to form one body with any religious society which shall be influenced by the same catholic spirit " and also ready to " alter or modify those points which ..... are subject to

to human alteration " .Conferences were to be initiated with other Communion s .The House of Bishops approved the resolution but it was not favourably received by the deputies ( P.V. Norwood op cit p 23 ) .

In 1853 a memorial was presented to the House of Bishops suggesting a General Council of Christendom " to unite those who are estranged from one another , in all necessary harmony and unity , to put down error among Christians , and to spread a united and missionary Church over the whole world " ( The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register ,Vol. VII 1854 -55 , pp 59-70 ; Slosser op. cit . p 230 ) .Further " to submit the practicability ..... of some ecclesiastical system , broader and more comprehensive than that which you now administer , surrounding and including the Protestant Episcopal Church as it now is , leaving the Church untouched , identical with that Church in all its great principles, yet providing for as much freedom in opinion , discipline , and worship,as is compatible with the essential Faith and Order of the Gospel .To define and act upon such a system , it is believed , must sooner or later be the work of an American Catholic Episcopate " ( Tiffany Memorial App.D History of the Protestant Episcopal Church ; Norwood op. cit . pp 23-24 ) . The " Memorial " is associated with William Augustus Muhlenberg ( vide C.A. Briggs Christian Unity London 1910 ) .

In 1870 Dr W.R. Huntington in his work " Church Idea : An Essay Towards Unity " first seems to have formulated the idea of the quadrilateral adopted by the Chicago General Convention of 1886 .Two years later the Lambeth Conference proposed the four points of the quadrilateral as a basis for re-union negotiations .Thus it is the glory of the American Protestant Episcopal Church that she was enabled to initiate the great modern movements towards Church Union .

We have described how the Northern Presbyterians accepted the invitation of the Chicago Convention " to enter into brotherly conference " .In the meetings that ensued negotiations were broken off when it appeared that the Episcopal Church was not prepared " to treat with the Presbyterians on a basis of equality of validity of orders " ( Slosser op. cit . p 337 ) .

The " Appeal to all Christian People " issued by the 1920 Lambeth Conference had a profound effect upon the problems of Church unity in the United States .Acting upon this and on the basis of the Chicago -Lambeth quadrilateral the General Convention of the American Episcopal Church in October 1937 requested the Presbyterian Church to unite in making the following declaration :

" The two Churches , one in the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ , the Incarnate Word of God , recognising the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith , accepting



the two sacraments ordained by Christ , and believing that the visible unity of Christ's Church is the will of God , hereby formally declare their purpose to achieve organic union between their respective churches " ( F.C. Grant The Proposed Concordat between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church New York 1940 p 4 ) .

The invitation was accepted by the Presbyterian General Assembly in May 1938 . Conversations between the Commission on Approaches to Unity of the Episcopal Church and a committee representing the Presbyterian Department on Church Co-operation and Union have passed through three stages . How was it possible to have a shared ministry in local areas where the need was obvious ? This stage of the negotiations is represented by a document known as the Concordat . The joint commission , however , soon felt the base of their deliberations widened owing to the need of a ministry mutually recognised . The document known as Joint Ordination marks a second stage . This rather naturally led to a more comprehensive plan for a United Church . The previous document was withdrawn and another , Basic Principles , was issued representing a sketch for the first scheme of a United Church . The scheme " is not a finished piece of work . It is still in a fluid stage " ( Report of the Commission on Approaches to Unity to the General Convention , Cleveland , Ohio 1943 p 3 ) .

The 1943 Report of the Commission appointed by the General Convention stated " In the judgement of your Commissioners the Episcopal Church has come to a valley of decision after fifty - seven years of intermittent negotiations with the Presbyterian Church " ( Report ibid p 5 ) .It may be of some interest to our inquiry that we should examine the relevant points raised in this important document .

It is stated " Admittedly the most stubborn problems arise out of the fact that we are an " Episcopal " Church and they are a " Presbyterian " Church .Here the difficulties to be overcome do not arise chiefly in the realm of Church government but arise with respect to the orders of ministers and their functions and the manner of their ordination " ( Report op cit Sect c p 6 ) .Again , " If we make particular interpretations of episcopacy or orders or sacraments , which are earnestly held by important elements within our Church but are not in practice required today in our Church , a condition of reunion , we shall be asking of the Presbyterians more than we ask of our own membership " ( Report p 7 ) .Thus " Is the Episcopal Church prepared to move towards organic union ; with a Church which is willing to accept the historic episcopate while not prepared to accept a particular doctrine concerning it ? " ( ibid ) . The Report concludes " The Department of Church Co-operation and Union of the Presbyterian Church have given us the assurance of

their willingness to recommend to the Presbyterian Church the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate " ( Ibid pp8-9 ) .

The Report of the Joint Commission amends the Basic Principles of the proposed accommodation under six sections .Section II dealing with Government states : " There shall be in the united Church a series of graduated councils ( or judicatories ) . Such councils shall be established within the parish , within the diocese or presbytery , and within the province or synod ; and there shall be a supreme judicatory, the General Assembly or Convention " . The Bishop or his deputy is to be moderator of the Presbytery which is to elect its bishop .Also :

- a. It shall have power to examine and receive candidates for the ministry .
- b. At ordinations clerical representatives of the Presbytery shall ' participate ' with the bishop in the laying on of hands .
- c. The Presbytery shall have power to install pastors in their charges and to dissolve the pastoral relationship .
- d. The presbytery shall have power to receive complaints against ministers and to arrange for their trial .

The Province shall consist of six or more dioceses with the Synod as its council consisting of bishops ,presbyters and ruling elders .The General Assembly shall have like composition .

Perhaps Section III under the heading " Ministry and Lay Leadership " is especially relevant .It may be summarised thus :

I. All men ordained after the effective date of union will bear authority of both traditions .

Ministers ordained in either Church prior to the union will receive the authority of the other .

2. a.The Episcopate

Bishops shall have powers and duties traditionally theirs , and these shall be set forth in the Constitution .They shall be exercised in concurrence with the Presbytery and shall include supervision of public worship, discipline , and leadership in the spread of the Gospel.As chief Pastor , the Bishop shall exercise oversight of the Churches and their teaching, shall administer Confirmation, and , with clerical members of the Presbytery, shall officiate at ordinations of presbyters and deacons on behalf of the whole Church .He shall preside at or take order for meetings of the

Presbytery and at inductions and installations and similar offices , and shall take counsel with pastors and candidates for the ministry .The office of a bishop is also a teaching office .Upon the episcopate is laid the responsibility of witnessing to the doctrine of the Church and of urging its application to the conditions of the age . Whilst differing views and beliefs have been held and will be permitted in the united Church , it is agreed that the continuity of the episcopate which has come down from the undivided Church shall be effectively maintained both at the inauguration of the union and thereafter .

b. The presbyterate

In the ministry of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel presbyters share equally with bishops .As members of the presbytery , they shall participate with the Bishop in the government of the Church. They shall serve in the higher councils of the Church when elected thereto .

At the Union in every diocese and presbytery there shall be formal services of mutual recognition and extension of authority to minister in the United Church . The Moderator of the presbytery and his attending presbyters will lay their hands upon the Episcopal bishops

and priests to be commissioned ; likewise the Bishop and his attending presbyters will lay their hands upon the Presbyterian ministers to be commissioned .The Moderator or Bishop shall use the form following :

Here the Moderator or Bishop shall say to the minister to be commissioned :

The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments which thou hast already received is hereby recognised ; and the grace and authority of Holy Orders as conferred by this Church are now added.

Then the Moderator or Bishop with attending presbyters shall lay hands on the minister to be commissioned and say :  
Take thou authority to execute thy ministry and to dispense the Word of God and His holy Sacraments in this United Church ; in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost .  
Amen " .

### C. The Diaconate

Candidates for the ministry shall first be ordained to the diaconate , and shall generally be continued in this status for one year , Before such ordination the candidate shall have a probationary period , the length of which shall be within the discretion of the Presbytery of jurisdiction , and shall meet such spiritual , intellectual , and other requirements as the Constitution of the United Church shall prescribe .They shall

have the right to preach and teach under license and supervision of the bishop and presbytery , and to distribute the elements at Holy Communion when requested by a presbyter .

### Section III The Laity

. All share in the priesthood which the Church derives from Him .

a. The uniting Churches recognise the right of the congregations to elect their pastor or pastors , either directly or through delegated representatives . Administration of temporal affairs to be committed to wardens , vestrymen or trustees .

b. Ruling Elders are lay representatives of the people , chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline in conjunction with presbyters or pastors . They shall serve with presbyters in the superior councils of the Church when elected . They shall be set apart by prayer and laying on of hands by a presbyter . Such an elder may be commissioned by the bishop and presbytery to have pastoral charge of a congregation having no minister . The Constitution may authorise the setting apart of laymen as ruling elders for membership in the higher councils of the Church or for performance of special duties without first serving in the Council of the parish .

### C. :Lay Deacons

Congregations which so desire may elect lay

deacons and deaconesses .These may be set apart to serve the church , under appropriate vows , in its ministry of teaching, social service and charity .

#### Section IV

##### Other Basic Provisions

Confirmation shall be administered by the laying on of hands , with prayer by the bishop , or by a presbyter duly authorised by the bishop and presbytery .

In all ordinations and consecrations the true ordainer is God. In every ordination service there shall be imposition of hands, with prayer , an authorisation to minister and a designation of office .

Presbyters and Deacons shall be ordained by the bishop and presbytery who shall join with the laying on of hands .

In the service of consecration of bishops in the United Church there shall be

1. The solemn presentation of the bishop elect to the consecrating bishops by two presbyters of the diocese .
2. A prayer of consecration .
3. The laying on of hands by the bishops ( who shall be at least three in number ) and presbyters of jurisdiction. The customary vows of



fidelity to the Faith of the Church shall be taken .

When requested by a congregation the bishop and presbytery shall require the pastor elect to promise to minister the doctrine and worship in accordance with the forms to which the parish is accustomed .

## Section V

### Worship .

It is anticipated that eventually the United Church will have a common service book .No attempt will be made to abolish diversity of worship ; present uses allowed by the Book of Common Prayer and the Directory for Public Worship of God and Book of Common Worship , may be continued .A Liturgical Commission composed of those representing those accustomed to use the Book of Common Prayer and the Directory of Public Worship of God and the Book of Common Worship sitting together, shall prepare a book to be offered to the General Assembly for adoption as the common service of the united Church . This book shall contain liturgical services ,directions for worship , orders of service with provision for the use of extempore prayers , services for special occasions , and forms for the administration of the sacraments and for other rites and ceremonies .For a period of twenty-five years

after the Constitution or until otherwise provided by amendment of the Constitution the Liturgical Commission shall be composed of twenty members .

## Section VI

Concerned with property and contract rights ( Report op cit 1946 ) .

The Report of the Commission of Unity has not been unanimous .In 1943 the Minority Report states :

" It might be a fair question to ask whether an episcopate whose duties and powers are to be determined at some future date could in the nature of the case be the historic episcopate .However all uncertainty about it is dissolved by a covering letter which was sent with the Basic Principles from the office of the General Assembly to the constituent Presbyteries. To quote : ' The office of bishops as herein set forth is Presbyterian in its conception.....In Scotland Knox helped to ordain what were designated as Superintendents .Our own Presbyterian Church has , for practical purposes ,provided superintendents in many Synods and Presbyteries ' .In a meeting with our Commission members of the Presbyterian Department have frankly stated that when they speak of Bishops they mean Superintendents and nothing more .Obviously the Historic Episcopate is still an unsettled issue "

( 1943 Report p 13 ) .

Dr William T. Manning , late Bishop of New York , in criticising the " Proposed Basis of Union " states : " The Presbyterian Church officially and definitely maintains the doctrine of ' Parity of Orders ' ..... In every Episcopal function - including Ordination to the ministry - the Presbytery is equated with the Bishop..... I am not criticising the Presbyterians for maintaining their beliefs and convictions .I respect them for doing so .I say simply that this " Proposed Basis of Union " is not a unification of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches , it is a surrender of the principles for which the Episcopal Church stands and has always stood ( Rt Rev. William T.Manning The Issue Created by the " Proposed Basis of Union between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches -New York 1946 pp 3 & 4 ) .

Dr Theodore O.Wedel , representing the Liberal Evangelical section of the Episcopal Church states : " It is the conviction of the present writer that on this basic clash between Catholicism and Reformed Christianity , the latter is right .The Reformation view will ,I believe , some day win out , even in Catholicism " ( Theodore O. Wedel Episcopal -Presbyterian Unity - Ploughkeepsie ,N.Y. ; The Chronicle Vol. XLVI 10 July 1946 pp 222-3 ) .

Of similar mind to Canon Wedel , Sherman E.Johnson asserts " Do the presbyterians then accept the episcopate ?

Apparently they accept it wholeheartedly as a method of church order .Let everyone realise the immense significance of this .They reserve the right , which Episcopalians already possess to interpret it in various ways " ( Sherman E.Johnson article Episcopalian -Presbyterian Union -The Christian Century Sept . 4 th 1946 p 1059 ) .

In the Concurring Minority Report of Aug. 12 th 1946 Mr James G.Mitchell states " Subordination of the episcopate in the judicial field as well as the legislative area is implicit in the Proposed Basis " ( The Living Church vol. CXIII No 10 Sept. 8 th 1946 pp 5-6 ) .This is a similar criticism to that we have seen advanced against Leighton's accommodation .

In 1946 it was resolved by the General Convention that " the Presiding Bishop be requested to refer to the 1948 Lambeth Conference such proposals for Church Unity as are being considered by our Church, and which are related to the Anglican Communion , including the statement to be prepared by the Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity based upon the Lambeth Quadrilateral , as provided herein above ( Journal of the General Convention 1946 p 325 ) .

The Proposed Basis is one of the most interesting modern approaches to a presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation. It has been criticised on lines familiar to those acquainted with the fate of Leighton's accommodation .In respect to the

problems of ministerial integration the proposals would seem to bear out the experience of 1610 and indeed 1661 inasmuch as it is considered a practical process. The Presbyterians, on their part, would seem to much influenced by the Knoxian conception of the superintendency as a basis for their acceptance of the historic episcopate .

## **CHAPTER 14**

---

### **ATTEMPTS AT PRESBYTERIAN -EPISCOPAL ACCOMMODATION**

**MADE BY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN CANADA .**

The Church of England in Canada was , in the nature of things , soon confronted with the practical results of disunion. As early as 1886 the Provincial Synod appointed a Joint Committee " to confer with any similar Committees which might be appointed by other religious bodies on the terms upon which some honourable union might be arrived at " ( vide Slosser op. cit . p 236 ) .

The General Synod of the Church in celebrating its Jubilee year made a further appeal for unity . The United Church of Canada responded to the appeal in Feb. 1943 .This church itself had come into being hardly eighteen years previously by the union of the Congregational , Methodist and Presbyterian Churches on June 10 th 1925 ( United Church of Canada - Basis of Union- Historical Statement -Toronto Ryerson Press 1922 ; E. Lloyd Morr - ow Church Union in Canada - Toronto 1923 Chap I ; The Manual of the United Church of Canada Toronto 1944 pp 7-13 ) .The Joint Commission produced a Report which was presented to the General Synod meeting at Winnipeg in Sept .1946 .Both Houses commended it as being worthy of study during a three year period. The Foreword makes it clear that whilst the Report is commended " for study during the next three years .It will be noticed that there is no proposal for corporate reunion at the present time . The Conversations have had to do with the removal of difficulties"

( A Report from the Committee on Re-Union -Issued by the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada p 3 ) . It is further stated : " The Formularies of the two bodies were found to be in agreement on the doctrines necessary to be believed for salvation, and in particular on the Trinity and the Incarnation .This was considered to provide sufficient agreement for the beginning of conversations"( Report ibid p 4 ) . In a message from the Upper House of the General Synod the Bishop of Toronto states that during the three year period that the Report is under consideration there will be a meeting of the Lambeth Conference when opportunities will arise " of discovering the mind of the whole Anglican Communion on this question .We are concerned that the cause of the " Reunion of Christendom " throughout the world may not be hindered by any independent action on our part " ( Report p 6 ) .

In the Introduction the Report suggests the context of the conversations " But we also think that a special responsibility for leadership in co-operative unity falls upon our two communions .Between us we include at least two-thirds of reformed Christendom in Canada .....Much active co-operation and experience of each other are required before we can satisfactorily blend the Episcopal and Conciliar systems so as to secure the benefits of each " ( Report p 8 ) .



The Findings are under four heads :

- A. A Mutually Acceptable Ministry .
- B. Recommendations relating thereto
- C. Access of communicants to the Lord's Table, in both Communions
- D. General Conclusions .

In respect to the first it is suggested that the two ministries ,Episcopal and presbyterial are parallel rather than identical .The Church of England distributes the functions of the ministry among the three Orders of Bishops ,Priests and Deacons : the United Church between the Ministry and the Church Courts . Again , the functions of the second Order of the Ministry in the Church of England are not identical with the functions of the Ministry of the United Church .For United Church Ministers are not only equal with one another but , in virtue of their membership in Church Courts , are responsible along with their brethren for actions which in the Church of England are reserved for the Bishops " .On the other hand the parish priest in the Church of England has disciplinary authority which , in the United Church , is reserved for the Session ( Report p 9 ) .The Church of England members of the Committee " consider their United Church brethren to be Ministers of Christ , and to have in their ministry a real contribution to make in any future union : consequently ,they suggest that all such words as ' valid ' or 'invalid ' 'regular' or 'irregular ' , be not used , inasmuch as they are technical

terms whose proper application is solely to the threefold ministry of Holy Orders " ( Report p 9 ) . " The United Church members of the Committee , on the other hand , recognise that the ancient threefold ministry possesses an historic continuity and a special quality of its own in its emphasis on the sacramental life , liturgical worship , pastoral care and in that ordering of the Church's life which culminates in the oversight exercised by the Bishop as a Father in God " . Thus the Committee recommends that in any future union there should be a mutual contribution by each ministry . The object of this mutual reception would make it possible for the ministers of each Communion to minister in the other Communion , under the license and direction of the Bishop of the Diocese in the one case , and of the proper Church Courts in the other case . The further object of this mutual reception of the ministry is the removal of an obstacle to unity in the provision of a common Ministry ( Report p 10 ) .

This solution to the problem of ministerial recognition is important . Essentially a realistic approach it accepts facts as they are by relegating the question of validity to one of irrelevancy . On the other hand the Doctrine of Ministerial parallelism means that if the ministry of the United Church is to be mutual both traditions will have to be preserved . To this end the form of mutual ordination suggested in

the sections " Recommendations " and " The Ordination to the Full Ministry " is of interest .

The first recommendation states " that in the conferring upon Ministers of each Communion of the Ministry of the Other , the following declaration shall first be read by the Presiding Officer :

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost , Amen . Beloved in the Lord it has been agreed by the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada that in dependence upon Almighty God , in Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and seeking the aid of the Holy Spirit , we come to these solemn acts wherein we convey each to the other the graces of our several ministries , neither denying to the other its heritage in the Holy Catholic Church , nor the reality of its ministry , as a ministry of Christ , but both desiring to increase our gifts and enlarge our opportunities for the extension of Christ's Kingdom " .

This declaration is to be read when " a priest of the Church of England in Canada is first received into full communion in the United Church of Canada , then is licensed to preach and then ordained to the full ministry of the United Church " or when " A Minister of the United Church is first confirmed then ordained to

the diaconate and then advanced to the priesthood of the Church of England in Canada " ( Report p 10 ) .

In the case of the priest of the Church of England " He shall produce to the appropriate Church Courts evidence of his Baptism and Ordination , and of his having familiarized himself with the doctrine , discipline and worship of the United Church . He shall promise that in ministering in congregations of the United Church he shall conform thereto " .

In the form for " Reception to Full Communion " the priest shall stand before the presiding minister .After the Apostle 's Creed and questions " the Minister , offering to him the right hand of fellowship shall say :

The God of all grace , who hath called you  
unto his eternal glory by Jesus Christ , con-  
firm: you to the end , that ye may be blameless  
in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ .Amen .

Then follows the Licensing to Preach .

In the Ordination to the Full Ministry the presid-  
ing Minister will read the declaration :

A.B. , who has already been ordained Priest in  
the Church of God according to the use of the  
Church of England desires to exercise the  
Ministry in the United Church of Canada .We  
recognise the Ministry which he has already

received and acting under the authority of the Church are about to admit him to the Sacred Ministry as the United Church of Canada has received the same , calling down upon him the blessing of the Holy Spirit , that he may have all necessary grace and power faithfully to fulfill the same , and granting him authority to minister among us " .

The act of ordination :

" When this prayer is done , the Presiding Minister with two or more of the Ministers present , shall lay their hands upon the head of every one that receiveth Ordination , the Receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees , and the Presiding Minister saying :

The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Spirit for the Office and Work of a minister in the Church of God , now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church through the Imposition of our hands . And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God , and of his holy Sacraments ; in the name of the Father , and of the Son , and of the Holy Spirit . Amen . "

A minister of the United Church who is to receive Holy Orders in the Church of England in Canada " shall produce to the Bishop evidence of Baptism and Ordination , and of his having familiarized himself with the doctrine , discipline and worship of the Church of England in Canada .He shall promise that in ministering in congregations of the Church of England in Canada he shall conform thereto " .

The Bishop will then administer Confirmation : " this having been done the Bishop shall admit him to the Diaconate " . The Holy Communion may follow or the Bishop may let them depart with the blessing .On the same or some subsequent day the Minister shall come before the Bishop , other clergy and people , and be admitted to the Order of Priesthood according to the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer .

Instead of the presentation of the Candidate the Bishop rehearses the important formula :

" A.B. , who has already been ordained a minister of Christ according to the usage of the United Church of Canada desires to exercise the Ministry in the Church of England in Canada .We , recognizing the ministry which he has already received , and acting under Canon .... of the General Synod, are about to admit him to the Holy Order of Priesthood as required for the exercise of the

Ministry in the Church of England in Canada ,  
calling down upon him the blessing of the Holy  
Spirit that he may have all necessary grace and  
power faithfully to fulfill the same , and  
granting him authority to minister among us "  
( Report pp 16-17 ) .

The Ordination then proceeds as prescribed in the Book of  
Common Prayer .

In the Section " The Access of Communicants To the Lord's  
Table in Both Communion " the Report states : " After careful  
consideration , your Committee are unanimously of opinion that  
the problem of mutual access to Holy Communion should be given  
further and prayerful study before any solution is submitted to  
the Communion and that to this end the same Committee be  
continued " .

The concluding portion of the Report states :

1. It will be observed that the essential  
proposition , on which all the rest of this  
report depends , is that the two types of  
ministry are different .If that is conceded ,then  
the grace of each may be conveyed to the other ,  
without reservation '.

2. It is at least plain that both our ministries

are incomplete in practical affairs .While the Church of England is denied the assistance of a ministry which it acknowledges to be manifestly used of God , and while the United Church is denied the co-operation of a ministry whose reality it fully recognizes , both ministries are obviously less than they might be in the range of their operations .But if we realize that our ministries have been developed seperately for historical reasons , and that they differ both in function and in the source of their temporal authority , it becomes possible to unify them fully and without irrelevant and invidious comparison ."

3. However , it may be asked whether the gains of any such unifying would be commensurate with the upset to our ecclesiastical habits , which the process would necessarily involve .We are unanimously of the opinion that they would ..... We think that wherever a unified ministry existed and was utilised with wisdom and good feeling , a better distribution of man-power would be quickly felt on the frontiers , where at present



there is so great a need : Moreover , we believe that , with experience , some of the problems of city ~~ministries~~ might become less severe .It is probably true that a large part of the 1,500,000 lapsed members of our two Communion are to be found in our large centres of population ; and there with a mutual ministry 'colleges of churches ' could be formed working the needy districts together , especially in pastoral evangelism.A supreme necessity for the cities is the re-creation of the parish as a living and effective reality ; and that might be accomplished where a group of churches was responsible for its well -being , all working loyally in the interests of each other , shepherding the people into the fold to which they prefer to belong .In the course of time , it might be possible to create parish centres , in which the social work could be carried on , while the ~~separate~~ churches would be responsible for worship and direct religious work within their own walls , yet aiding one another in their ministry in times of stress and sickness .Moreover , the Churches ~~together~~ could communicate to each other new types of ministry , such as are found in Brotherhoods and Communities .

The Church of England has its Society of St John the Evangelist ; the United Church may be an inheritor of the Iona Community , whence so much new life is springing in the Church of All Nations , where people of many tongues and traditions worship according to the tradition of their fathers and yet work together in a common religious home .The advantages of closely knit theological colleges on the Campus of every university, with a strong , diversified staff and a large body of students, keeping the vision of the Unseen before the University as a whole , and exhibiting unity in diversity , are too obvious to elaborate .

4. Beyond all this , and much more that we can dream of , we shall convince those who are now returning to us from the strange brotherhood of war that the Christian Church is facing the unknown future , forgetting the unhappy things that are behind and pressing to the future , determined to use its power solely against evil and for good , and that it too, having learned the lesson of unity , cares first for the Christian good of Canada .

5 . Far off stands the splendid goal of the Reunion of Christendom .But it will only be reached by those who

are willing to take one step at a time ..... "

( Report ibid pp18-19 ) .

Few can read the Report without being impressed by its sense of realism .To the Churches of Great Britain ,confronted as they are by problems practical no less than theological , it is an inspiration .If there are doubts about the proposals we can once again refer to the Scottish precedents.Leighton's attitude towards supplemental ordination as that of Archbishop Sharp verifies the view that this could well be an approach to Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation .In Canada the United Church is Presbyterian in form ; it is probable that the Free Churches of England will some day come together under the same form .As in Scotland , therefore , so in England , the problem of union is likely to be one of Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation . The Canadian solution is likely to be suggestive and constructive .

## **CHAPTER 15**

---

### **THE AUSTRALIAN PROPOSALS**

As early as 1906 attempts were made to effect a union between the Church of England in Australia and the Church of Scotland Presbyterians .We have noted the Archbishop of Melbourne 's visit to Scotland previous to the Lambeth Conference of 1908 .The negotiations did not succeed owing to the difficulties experienced in respect to the re-ordination of Presbyterian ministers .For the next fourteen years the Presbyterians , Methodists and Congregationalists were concerned in effecting a union as a basis for a United Church of Australia ( Proposed Basis of Union -Revision of Joint Committee , Sept . 21 st to 23 rd 1921 Melbourne ,Brown Prior & Co . ) .The polity of the proposed United Church is similar to that of its Canadian counterpart but possibly influenced to a greater degree by the Presbyterian form ( Slosser op. cit . p346 ) .

The " Proposed Basis of Union " was formulated in 1918 as the result of the Melbourne Conference and finally revised in 1921 . In Sept. 1920 the negotiating churches voted upon the matter ; the result showed an insufficient majority among the Presbyterians .

The " Appeal to All Christian People " was transmitted to three Churches by the Bishops of the Church of England in Australia . As a result of this representatives of the Anglican , Presbyterian , Methodists and Congregationalists met for conference at the Church House , St Andrew's Cathedral , Sydney , on March 28-29 1922 ( Rt Rev. Gilbert White - Australia and Reunion 1922 ) .

During this conference Professor A. Harper contributed the Presbyterian view in a paper on " Non-Episcopal Views of Episcopacy ". It was his view that episcopacy might be accepted if :

1. It did not absolutely exclude presbyteral ordination .
2. Bishops should be elected by Christian people of the diocese .
3. The highest Church Assembly should have some voice in the choice .
4. All administrative acts of bishops should be open to review by that assembly .
- 5 . That assembly should consist of equal members
  - a. of presbyters all of the same grade and
  - b of selected laymen.

They should vote together on all questions .

The discussions were full of interest ; the Bishop of Bathurst said that there was no anti-democratic feeling in the Anglican Church in Australia , but the one thing needed to save democracy was the capacity to find leaders . The office of a bishop was an office of leadership . Bishops in Australia had the right of vetoing acts of the diocesan

synod , but he did not know of a case of the right being exercised .Canon Batey stated that the Church of England no longer said " We are right and you are wrong " but that " We are all wrong ; we can none of us claim to represent the Catholic Church in its fulness " . Every other form of ordination was questioned by some , the episcopal method alone by none .

The Methodist representative ,Dr Prescott , asked if any alternative suggestion had been or could be put forth to episcopacy .He thought that a practical and effective union could be effected only on that basis .

The Conference decided , in view , of all the circumstances that the polity of the reunited Church be episcopal provided :

1. The appointment to the office of a bishop be shared in by ministry and laity .
2. That such office be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner - i.e. that in all administrative actions , the bishop should be responsible to the representative assembly , conference , or synod of the Church ; and
3. that such acceptance of episcopacy does not necessarily imply that ministerial authority

cannot be otherwise obtained or that episcopacy is the only channel of divine grace .

In respect to Ordination the non-Anglican Churches in the main would assent to episcopal ordination if it meant a personal concession to the scruples of what they regarded as weaker brethren and as a means of qualifying for ministry in a larger United Catholic Church . Mutual or supplemental ordination must not bear any mark of the repudiation of past orders . The Lambeth Appeal , it was claimed , on this point, spoke with a divided and ambiguous voice . On the one hand it said that no one could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry , yet at the same time it required " a commission through episcopal ordination " which seemed to imply ordination ab initio and that their present ordination meant nothing at all .

Finally the resolution was passed " That the Conference recommends that the conditions for the mutual recognition of episcopal and non-episcopal orders and commissions be thoroughly explored by the respective Churches , and to this end recommends the appointment of a Committee for the purpose of receiving reports from such Churches , and ascertaining the possibility of arriving at a common mind , and reporting to a



further Conference " .

The succeeding Conferences have therefore been especially concerned in devising a formula for the episcopal ordination of non-episcopally ordained ministers ( Theology Vol.V No 29 Nov. 1922 pp 280-84 ) .

The same approach to accommodation is also found in the Proposals of an Australian Intercommunion Group .This movement originated in a National Missionary Conference held at Sydney in April 1937 .Concerned with missionary problems in the South Pacific there came a vision of a United Church in the Pacific .As in similar movements " whatever reasons might be advanced for denominational separateness at the Home Base , none could consistently be given for such a lack of unity among the infant Churches of the South Seas " ( Intercommunion - A Summary of the Discussions and Proposals of an Australian Group 1937- 40 Sydney 1942 p 3 ) .As in South India the comity of missions had avoided the dangers of overlapping among non -Roman missionary societies but there was still the problem of the native Christians , who by change of residence , found themselves in another denominational environment.The obstacle to intercommunion was the fact that no one view of the Christian ministry was generally acceptable .However , " As time went on we discovered that we could not limit our inquiries and

discussions to any particular mission field , for there were practical difficulties in the way while the Churches at home remained apart .Hence it was borne in upon us that we must face the whole question of intercommunion as it presents itself both at home and abroad .At this stage , therefore , we invited our presbyterian brethren to join us , so that the four largest non-Roman Communions - Communions which had in the past been considering a closer unity - might together study the situation " ( Report p 4 ) .

The great obstacle to a meeting together at the Holy Table was the differing conceptions of the authority and function of the Christian ministry ; "Our task was to find some way to ensure a ministry acceptable to and recognised by all concerned , without doubt or scruple to any " .

There were two divergent views :

I. The non-episcopal members of the group urged that all that was necessary was a common recognition of the ministry of their respective Churches . With this recognition , only a formal commission to preach and administer the sacraments in each branch of the Church would be required , the ministers of the Congregational , Methodist and Presbyterian Churches holding their ordination is a sufficient qualification .

2. The Anglican representatives urged that in view of the essential importance attached by very large numbers of Anglicans to episcopal ordination , such a proposal could not form a basis for intercommunion with the Church of England as a whole .

It was decided , rather than wait until one or other of these views became acceptable to the majority that it would be best "to explore some other path " ( Report pp5 & 6 ) .Hence the adoption of the Mutual Formula .

In its final revision of Oct 29 th 1943 the Preface includes the statements :

It is our conviction that such a reunited Fellowship is the Will of God and that it should be initiated by the mutual laying on-of-hands with prayer , and with the use of such a formula as shall leave no room for scruple or doubtfulness .It is understood that the acceptance of a wider ministerial commission does not in any sense imply re-ordination , but represents , in the view of those who have taken part in those conferences , the only practical method of securing such an extension of ministerial authority as will accomplish the desired end .

The Declaration states :

a. I , believing myself to have been duly called and ordained to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments

in the Church of God , am yet conscious of a desire for a wider exercise of the office in a reunited Fellowship .

b. I , also believing that God wills one Communion and Fellowship for the building of His Kingdom , and that there should therefore be an inter-change of Commissions between all who have been regularly called and lawfully set apart for the Ministry of His Holy Word and Sacraments , am humbly prepared by the mutual laying -on-of-hands with prayer , freely and willingly , to give and to receive , to bestow and to share , so far as lies within my power , such further authority as shall seem " good to the Holy Ghost and to Us " .

The Mutual Formula is introduced by the Prayer

" Almighty God , who hast bestowed upon Thy servants diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit and hast called them to minister on Thy behalf to the souls of men ; Empower by Thy Holy Spirit this laying -on-of-hands with prayer that it may be used of Thee to the enrichment of our ministries in the service of Thy Holy Church through Jesus Christ our Lord .Amen "

The Form of Order then proceeds :

" Receive the Holy Ghost for the wider exercise of thy ministry in the Church , take thou authority to preach the Word of God

and to minister Christ's sacraments , in fulfilment of the ministry of reconciliation in the congregations whereunto thou shall be further called or regularly appointed ; and see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying-on -of-hands " .

The exercise of the Formula is governed by four rubrics :

1. In any area where it is desired to put these proposals into effect the Formula of Prayer for the laying -on-of - hands is to be said by a group consisting of at least two duly chosen and appointed ministers of each Christian Communion committed in this way to intercommunion and fellowship.
2. All such duly chosen and appointed ministers shall individually receive the mutual laying-on-of-hands with Prayer on the occasion of their first participating in this mutual rite , but no minister shall receive such laying -on-of-hands more than once from any one communion .
3. This having been fulfilled the same formula shall be used by such duly chosen and appointed ministers when laying their hands with Prayer on the head of each minister presenting himself for participating in this mutual rite .
4. All ,who have received the mutual laying -on-of-hands with Prayer may be "further called " to officiate temporarily in any other participating Communion , if invited to do so , by the lawful authority of that Communion or may be " regularly

appointed " without further laying -on-of-hands with Prayer , to a pastoral charge in that Communion , provided that the customary tests and regulations have been observed " .

In the supplementary notes it is stated : " It is understood that this mutual laying-on-of-hands with Prayer does not supersede the normal rite of ordination in each participating communion ; nor does it commit anyone so participating to a particular theory of the ministry " . In respect to mutual service : "Further called " shall mean lawful invitation to officiate temporarily in any other participating communion ". Again , " Regularly appointed " shall mean appointment in accordance with the tests and regulations which are customary prior to ordination by the participating communions concerned " ( Mss Declaration and Mutual Formula -Final Revision Oct. 29 th 1943 ; F. De Witt Batty -The Australian Proposals for Intercommunion - Lond. 1948 pp23-24) .

The Report of 1940 comments , and this is important , " It must be clearly understood that the discussions of the Group have not been related to the problem of Church Union per se , though we are not without hope that the removal of barriers to intercommunion may eventually result in a closer co-operation and unity in the great and common task committed to us by Our Lord " ( Report op cit p 5 ) .

Yet another formula has been devised by Dr Halse , the Archbishop of Brisbane :

" Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God ; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God to fulfill the ministry of reconciliation , and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregation whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed .And see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying on of hands "

This latter formula has been submitted to scholars of all the communions concerned , and has received a wide measure of approval .It is now under consideration by the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference ( vide The Church Times June 13 th 1947 ) .

Perhaps it would be relevant to refer to a statement made by Dr.W.C.Wand when Archbishop of Brisbane :

" Controversialists , whether Orthodox , Roman or Free Churchmen , must feel that in discussion with Anglicans

they hear of little but bishops and their succession .It is time to let the world know that we realize the importance of many other elements of the Christian life . In the organism of the Divine Society episcopacy is like the spine in the human body .It is certainly necessary , but like the spine it probably functions best when it is not obtruded " ( Union of Christendom p 424 ) .

The Mutual Formula is essentially an essay in reconciliation .We may justly assert that the pioneers in this field were those who had laboured for Presbyterian-Episcopal accommodation in Scotland .



## CHAPTER 15 .

---

### THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME .

The field of Church Unity has long been dominated by the attempts to constitute the Church of South India . The uniting churches are : the South India United Church ; the South India Province of the Methodist Church ; and the dioceses of Madras , Dornakal , Tinnevelly , and Travancore and Cochin in the Church of India , Burma and Ceylon ( Proposed Scheme of Union Seventh Edition , The Christian Literature Society for India , Madras 1947 Part II p 23 ) .

The South India United Church was composed of Congregational and Presbyterian elements . It derived its formulation from the Union of the Churches of the Arcot Mission of the Dutch Reformed Church in America and the Madras Mission of the United Free Church of Scotland which took place in 1901 . In 1905 the Travancore Mission of the London Missionary Society and the Jaffa and Madura Missions of the American Board amalgamated . They were both Congregational . This union , in 1907 , combined with the South India Synod of the Presbyterian Church and the Union of 1901 . The following year they were joined by the Churches of the South India District Committee upon the formation of the South India United Church . Thus this Church represented the Congregational and Presbyterian elements ( Slosser op. cit . pp 268-70 ) .

In 1909 the Union Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. initiated a Conference at Jubbulpore to promote a federation of the Christian Churches in India .The scheme of federation included an evangelical creed , the " Recognition of the validity of each other's ordinances , ministry , membership , and discipline , without thereby committing themselves to the approval of particular methods or practices " ( Report of the Edinburgh Conference Vol. VII p III ff) .The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in India and of the South India United Church gave their approval but the Anglicans , Baptists , and Lutherans made no move in the matter .

Slowly but surely the wider vision presented itself. Following the upheaval of the Great War and inspired by the work of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee a historic meeting was held at Tranquebar in the May of 1919 when thirty-three ministers of the Anglican Church of India ,Burma and Ceylon and of the South India United Church met to prepare a statement on Church Union ( The International Review of Missions vol. XXXVII No 145 Jan. 1948 p 49 ) .In 1920 a joint committee of the two churches was formed which

was joined by representatives of the Methodist Church .The first scheme for a United Church in South India was completed in 1929 ( The Churchman vol. LXI No 3 pp 104-5 ) .We may justly say , therefore , that the union represents the three essential elements : congregational ,presbyterial and episcopal .The Church of South India will be the first practical attempt to put into effect the principals advocated by Leighton and other workers for Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in Scotland .

Besides the divine imperative what are the forces making for union in South India ? Under the inspiration of Dr John Mott the Christian Councils formed of practically all the non-Roman missions agreed to formal rules of " comity " .Thus the dangers of overlapping were avoided but this resulted , as the late Bishop Azariah stated , in a situation wherein the Indian Christians found their Church connection to be geographical , not theological .acute difficulties arose when Christians moving from one area of comity to another found themselves unable to enter into full fellowship with the church of their new district . Again , the Indian mind is impatient of Western divisions which have their origins in an alien historical process . " They are convinced that the Church should be one ; they are duly resentful at the cleavages introduced by foreigners.

They want a national expression of Christianity - an Indian Church " ( E.H.M.Waller , Bishop of Madras -Church Union in South India S.P.C.K. 1929 p 30 ) .The existence of Christian sects as such to the " sectional " mind of the Indian is another problem which has to be faced .Father W.H.G.Holmes of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta has stated that the Christian sects do not prove bewildering to the convert from Hinduism and Islam : " In Hinduism there are multitudes of sects , and this variety is regarded by Hindus as one of the chief glories of their religion .In Islam the case is the same .A Muslim has been known to argue for the superiority of Islam to Christianity on the ground that Islam has the greater number of sects ..... A considerable part of the work in India of the present writer for more than a quarter of a century has been to try and answer the questionings of non-Christians all over the country , and in all these years , with letters arriving daily , the fingers of one hand would be enough to count the number of correspondents who have found the presence of different Christian societies a difficulty .A question as to the difference between Catholic and Protestant will be asked from time to time as a matter of interest but not urged as a hindrance to the adoption of the Christian faith " ( The

Review of the Churches vol. VII No I Jan 1930 p 72 ) . In this connection another experienced worker , Bishop E.H.M. Waller observes " Hinduism can include thousands of differing sects but all are Hindus . Muhamudans can belong to different sections of Islam , but act as one body .Why should Christians be kept apart by half -understood differences ? " ( E.H.M.Waller op. cit . p 31 ) . The problems of the caste system , whatever its place in the past , are an open sore in the Body of Christ in India . Closer fellowship within the Christian family will at least be a salve .There are other considerations no less spiritual because of the practical issues .These include a unified structure designed to meet the great burden of educational and medical services offered by the Christian community .With the emergence of an independent India it is more than ever necessary that the voice of a united Christian India should be heard in a continent so sorely divided .Last but not least of the forces making for unity is an economic one ; can the Church in South India afford to be divided? Indeed it may yet prove a decisive factor not only in South India .

It is interesting to observe how these factors , nationalist , social , political and economic have had their place in the history of attempts to effect Presbyterian-Epis

copal accommodation in Scotland .

The long series of conferences found their culmination in the formal service of union at Madras on Sept . 27 th 1947 .Only two members of the Tranquebar Conference , an Indian and an Englishman , were spared to be present at the fulfilment of those early hopes .The movement of the Holy Spirit may be humbly recognised in the long process which has led many so far along the path of at-one- ment .Of this process, Dr John Banninga ( forever an honoured name in the Church of India ) said in 1930 " The members of the Committee crave for their whole Church the spiritual experience that they themselves have had in their Committee meetings " ( The Review of the Churches vol. VII No I Jan. 1930 p 32 ) .

Bishop E.J.Palmer ,formerly of Bombay , has summarised the Scheme as being :

1. Union by Combination .

2. Union by Confluence .

The outstanding characteristic of Union by Combination is that it is the very antithesis of union by absorption or union by submission .This is not theory ;

the union which in 1906 resulted in the South India United Church was built on this principle. After twenty years trial the Presbyterian and Congregational elements have been combined and in so doing have modified each other. What was valuable in either has survived and become more valuable because enriched by the co-operation of the complementary principle .

Union by confluence represents the general view of the negotiations that " Union is not unification" . It is essentially a psychological approach to the problem . For the member of one denomination instinctive impulses have been built up by years of receiving and welcoming ideas of one kind only .This deposit of feeling now laid in the unconscious is very difficult to reach by any intellectual conviction or even by act of volition .Hence the process of union must be one of confluence .This is especially illustrated in the expression of worship .The uniting churches will continue to use their present forms ; Anglicans that of the Book of Common Prayer ; the Methodists , the Book of Common Prayer with the addition of extempore forms as is their present custom , the South India United Church the Directory of Public Worship , which is optional and extempore forms .As the result of worshipping-



ing together and working together the South India Church looks forward to the evolution of a common form of worship .This is only an illustration from one department of the Church's life , it is applicable to its whole activity .In this great matter we dare not relegate the psychological factor to a minor role ( The Review of the Churches Vol. VII No I Jan . 1930 ) . The Church of South India has done great service in showing her fellow Christians one necessary step we must all surely take .

The Tranquebar Conference in 1919 accepted the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886 as the basis for negotiations and in 1920 the Joint Committee resolved that : " believing that the principle of the historic episcopate in a constitutional form is that which is more likely than any other to promote and preserve the unity of the Church , we accept it as a basis of unity without raising any other questions about episcopacy " ( C.S.Milford South India 's New Church ,London 1947 p 8 ) .

In the succeeding conversations , as in the previous attempts we have considered , no great difficulties were met in the matter of doctrine : " All were prepared to accept the Creeds as witnessing to the primitive Faith of the Church ; and all inherited also the tradition of the Reform-

ation and gladly acknowledged the supremacy of the Scriptures " ( Milford op.cit . p 9 ) .The central issue concerned the doctrine of the Church's unity and continuity expressed in the ministry ( J.E.Leslie Newbigin , Bishop in Madura and Ramnad , The Reunion of the Church , London 1948 p 106 ) .How , indeed was it possible to effect a union between the four dioceses of the Anglican communion , claiming to have maintained unbroken the succession of episcopal consecration and ordination from the undivided Church , with other Churches which possess a ministerial succession discontinuous with this episcopal succession ? ( Newbigin - ibid ) . The whole genius of the Scheme lies in the solution finally adopted .

Conditional ordination or mutual re- comissioning without re-ordination were found unacceptable ( Waller op. cit . p 67 ) .Thus it was recognised that it would be impossible to obtain a fully unified ministry from the inauguration of the union : " While at the time of the union the Church will include a large number of ministers who have not received episcopal ordination , it is agreed that the intention and expectation of the uniting Churches is that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the United Church will be an episcopally ordained minister .For a period of 30 years from the inauguration of the union , the ministers of any Church whose missions have founded the originally separate

parts of the United Church may be received as ministers of the united Church provided they accept its Governing Principles and Constitution .After this period of 30 years the Church itself will determine the conditions under which it is to receive ministers from other Churches ( Newbiggin op. cit. p 107 ) .The words of the Basis of Union explain the position :  
  
Sect 16 " The uniting Churches agree that it is their intention and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister " ( Proposed Scheme of Union Seventh Edition 1947 p 17 ) .

This solution had been reached after the Conference -s at Bangalore in 1920 ,Pasumalai in 1923 and Trichinopoly in 1926 .At Pasumalai it was found that in rejecting conditional and mutual ordination " The only possible solution seemed to be a return to the proposal of a double ministry and a gradual unification of it by natural process . The problem then became a question of finding the right formula to explain the limitations of such a scheme " ( Waller op.cit . p68 ) .

In the process of ministerial integration it was recognised that there would be one obvious difficulty .At the seventh meeting of the Committee on Union which met at Bangalore in 1928 this was faced " The great object of complete spiritual unity within the Church will never be

attained till all members are willing and wishful to receive Communion equally in every Church , but the attainment of this object will only be retarded if authorities or majorities in the united Church make arrangements which have the effect of forcing those who have conscientious objections to receiving Communion from ministers not episcopally ordained to do so or else to forgo Communion " ( Waller op. cit . p 71 ) .

The Conference held at Madras in 1929 in attempting to formulate a coherent scheme to present to the Churches concerned again faced this problem . The meeting repeated the statement of the final aim - the taking of Communion together by all . It recognised " that the act of union will initiate a process of growing together into one life and of advance towards complete spiritual unity . If during this process difficulties and anomalies arise , the united Church will be careful not to allow any overriding of conscience by Church authorities or by majorities ; nor will it in its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long established traditions of any of the uniting Churches . They believe that these ends can rightly be attained , not by the framing of detailed regulations , but by assurances given and received in a spirit of mutual confidence and love . They therefore pledge themselves and fully trust each other

that in the united church no arrangements with regard to churches , congregations , or ministers will knowingly be made , either generally or in particular cases, which would offend the conscientious convictions of any persons directly concerned or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church or imperil its subsequent progress towards union with other Churches " ( Waller op. cit. p 73 )

This was officially expressed in the Constitution :

" The Church of South India therefore pledges itself that it will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience either by Church authorities or by majorities, and will not in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed .Neither forms of worship or ritual , nor a ministry to which they have not been accustomed , or to which they conscientiously object ,will be imposed upon any congregation ; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made , either generally or in particular cases , which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly

concerned , or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches " ( Proposed Scheme -Constitution p34).

The Pledge has rather naturally given rise to some controversy .The Lambeth Conference of 1930 in giving their general approval to the scheme commented on the Pledge " We understand this pledge to secure that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited , that an episcopally ordained ministry is within our Church required for the due administration of Holy Communion , will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by this rule " . The reaction of the non-Episcopal churches was to fear that the ministries of the United Church would still be ~~separate~~ ones . In practice ex-Anglicans would be entitled to minister to any congregation ; the non-episcopal churches would be restricted to the former Free Churches .This situation was met in 1934 when the Joint Committee , with the concurrence of the Anglican members defined the Pledge :

" ..... the Committee does not understand the pledge to imply that the fact that a minister ( of the united church ) has previously been a minister of either an episcopal or a non-episcopal church

will itself debar him from appointment to or working in any congregation of the united church where that congregation desires it ( Para III Minute 1934 Conference ) .

" ..... The Joint Committee wishes further to urge upon the negotiating Churches that while the purpose for which these provisions have been inserted in the Basis of Union will not be fulfilled unless the real scope and effect of the Pledge be understood by all parties , that purpose will be entirely defeated if detailed interpretation of the pledge and precise statement of its application to particular and hypothetical cases are demanded " ( ibid para. 5 ) .

This became known as the 1934 Interpretation which left it open to any congregation to insist on having an episcopal minister, but would not lay this down as a rule of the church during the interim period ( Milford op cit p 12 ) .

It was felt in some quarters that the provision of the third paragraph " where that congregation desires it " implied an excessive congregationalism .The Joint Committee accordingly defined its position in the minute of 1946

1. Such appointments would not be made if a congregation objects on conscientious grounds, and

2. as stated in II (9) of the Governing Principles of the Church, ' every pastorate .... shall have an opportunity of expressing its judgement ..... as to the appointment ( this ) remains with the duly constituted authority of the United Church " .

also " It is understood that during the period of unification , congregations will ordinarily continue to be served by the ministries to which they are accustomed , except where pastoral needs obviously demand other arrangements .The duly constituted authority within the united Church shall be the sole judge of the urgency of such pastoral needs " ( Newbiggin op. cit . pp II7-II8 ) .Bishop Newbiggin comments : " What the pledge does is to recognise that the unity of the Church is a reality in the personal order , and that therefore the terms of the union are not to be used to over-ride conscientious conviction , but that everything is to be done for the pastoral good of the Church .Every presbyter in the Church will be capable of performing the ministerial acts which belong to his office, and where - in the judgement of the Church - the pastoral good of the Church requires it , he may be called upon to minister in any congregation .But pastoral ends will not be served by acts which over-ride deeply held convictions



and coerce conscientious minorities " ( Newbigin - op. cit . p II8)

In 1941 the Joint Committee appealed for a final decision on the scheme . In Jan. 1943 the Methodist Church stated " that the Methodist Church in South India should enter into union on the basis of the proposed scheme " adding a request that the 1934 interpretation be printed as an addendum to the pledge in the basis of union . The Anglican Church in 1942 placed the scheme before the diocesan councils for their decision .The General Council met in February 1942 and it was obvious that the majority of dioceses would vote in its favour. Once again the proposal for " supplemental ordination " was put forward its sponsor being Dr Hubback , then Bishop of Assam , now Metropolitan. Having been accepted by the Council the proposal was remitted to the Joint Committee .It did not ,as earlier , prove acceptable . In 1944 the Joint Committee decided, as suggested by the Methodists , that the 1934 interpretation should be printed with the scheme .By the end of 1944 the required number of dioceses had voted in favour , only one expressed opposition and that by a very narrow majority .The four Southern dioceses concerned had all voted in favour .In Jan. 1945 the General Council by a 75 per cent vote allowed the four southern dioceses to separate from the Anglican Province of India , Burma and Ceylon to enter the united church .In doing so the Anglican Church emulated the sacrifice of the Methodists

and the Presbyterians of the South .The South India United Church itself found progress more laborious .There were two of the eight Church Councils still in opposition ;Travancore , in which the Congregationalist element was strong and which had the largest membership , voted in favour by an insufficient majority .Meanwhile the Anglican episcopate stated that when the General Council voted in 1945 the 1934 Interpretation was not formally before them . The difference between the interpretation and the Lambeth statement on the Pledge was a further factor to be considered .The South India United Church by 1946 secured sufficient agreement and its General Assembly proceeded to its final vote .In accepting the scheme they made it conditional upon the General Council's formal acceptance of the 1934 Interpretation .In January 1947 the General Council approved the Interpretation at the same time endorsing the further interpretation furnished by the Joint Committee in 1946 ( vide Scheme Basis p 32 note 2 ) . The way for the union was now clear ; the Church of South India came into being on September 27 th 1947 .

In the Church there are fourteen dioceses and not fifteen as originally planned .The North Tamil Council of the South India United Church decided not to enter the union for the present .One diocese ,Jaffna , is in the north of Ceylon.In a sense it will be an intrusion into a neighbouring diocese

and a Methodist District .The reason for this is that the new diocese will consist of Congregationalists only who were already members of the South India United Church and did not wish to be separated from their brethren .

Of the episcopate six are the present Anglican bishops . Of the nine newly consecrated bishops four are Indians ( two Congregationalists , one Methodist , one Anglican ) .The remaining five are British missionaries , two Methodist , one Presbyterian , one Congregational and one Anglican .The new dioceses are obviously smaller than those existing in the former Anglican province . This will ensure a return to the chorepiscopal ideal which has always been a vital necessity in schemes of accommodation .

The membership of the church at the union was approximately one million of whom half are Anglicans , 225,000 Methodists and about 300,000 belong to the South India United Church ( Milford op.cit . p 14 ) .This number is approximately 25 per cent of all the non-Roman Christians in the whole of India .Those denominations not joining the union include the Baptist ,Lutheran , the non-uniate Eastern Churches of Malabar and the Mar Thoma Church .

The Basis of Union under the heading "Necessary Elements" states :

" The uniting Churches recognise that episcopal ,presbyteral and congregational elements must all have their place in the order of life of the united church ,and that the episcopate , the presbyterate , and the congregation of the faithful should all in their several spheres have responsibility and exercise authority in the life and work of the Church , in its governance and administration , in its evangelistic and pastoral work , in its discipline , and in its worship " ( Scheme p 8 ) . The integration of these elements merit further consideration .

Chapter 2 Sect II " The Episcopate in the Church of South India " states :

" The Church of South India accepts and will maintain the historic episcopate in a constitutional form .But this acceptance does not commit it to any particular view or belief concerning orders of the ministry , and it will not require the acceptance of any such particular interpretation or view as a necessary qualification for its ministry .

Whatever differing interpretations there may be , however , the Church of South India agrees that , as

Episcopacy has been accepted in the Church from early times , it may in this sense fitly be called historic, and that it is needed for the shepherding and extension of the Church in South India .Any additional interpretation though held by individuals , are not binding on the Church of South India .

The meaning in which the Church of South India thus officially accepts a historic and constitutional episcopacy is that in it :

1. The bishops shall perform their functions in accordance with the customs of the Church , those functions being named and defined in the later chapters of this Constitution ;
2. The bishops shall be elected , both the diocese concerned in each particular case and the authorities of the Church of South India as a whole having an effective voice in their appointment .
3. Continuity with the historic episcopate will be effectively maintained , it being understood that as stated above ,no particular interpretation of the historic episcopate as that is accepted in the

Church of South India is thereby implied or shall be demanded from any minister or member of the Church ; and

4. every ordination of presbyters shall be performed by the laying on of hands by the bishops and presbyters , and all consecrations of bishops shall be performed by the laying on of hands at least of three bishops .

The Church of South India believes that in all ordinations and consecrations the true Ordainer and Consecrator is God , who in response to the prayers of His Church , and through the words and acts of its representatives , commissions and empowers for the office and work to which they are called the persons whom it has selected .

In the service of consecration of a bishop in the Church of South India , the person to be consecrated shall be solemnly presented to the bishop presiding at the consecration by three presbyters of the diocese to which he is to be appointed , and these three presbyters shall join with the bishops in the laying on of hands .If ,however ,the Diocesan Council concerned specially so determine ,hands shall be laid on by the bishops only .

In making this provision for episcopal ordination and consecration , the Church of South India declares that it is its intention and determination in this manner to secure

the unification of the ministry , but that this does not involve any judgement upon the validity or regularity of any other form of the ministry , and the fact that other Churches do not follow the rule of episcopal ordination will not in itself preclude it from holding relations of communion and fellowship with them "

( Proposed Scheme pp 31- 33 ) .

Chapter IV of the Constitution deals in rules I to 15 with " The Functions and Responsibilities of Bishops " . These include : Pastoral Oversight , Leadership in Evangelization , Teaching , Worship , Ordination , Authorization , Discipline , Discipline of Ministers , Diocesan Council and The Synod . The definition of these functions bear the obvious imprint of the Reformation Thesis . We may well ask would this episcopate have been acceptable to Knox and Calvin ? Would it have fulfilled the aspirations of the newly reformed Church in Scotland ? These are startling questions but startlingly relevant . In our earlier examination of the attempts of the Scotch Reformers to effect a satisfactory polity , we have shown how the very lack of these episcopal qualities diverted that polity further and further from the main stream of

of ecclesiastical tradition .To superficial judgement we may observe yet once again , that it was a negative process but was it really so ? Was the Church of South India possible without the long and tedious discernings of the attempts at Presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland ? No tortuous path hewn under the power of godly conviction leads to a wilderness .To negate this is to negate the power of the Holy Spirit .It is significant that the Archbishop of Canterbury 's Committee of Theologians comment in reference to this definition of episcopal function "It welcomed the positive conception of the Episcopate therein set forth " ( The South India Church Scheme -Report of a Committee of Theologians appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the Proposed Basis of Union and Constitution of the future Church of South India 1946 p 24 ) .Indeed the evolution of the constitutional episcopate in the Colonial and Scottish branches of the Anglican Communion may be described as similarly indebted .That one of the newly consecrated bishops in the South India Church ,Bishop Leslie Newbigin , is a Church of Scotland minister is particularly providential .

It is relevant that we should examine the



preservation of the Presbyterian and Congregational elements in the scheme .Before doing so we must remember the fact that the South India United Church , was itself a union of the Congregational and Presbyterian elements .

Modern Presbyterian polity , the General Assembly , Synod and Kirk Session is represented by the Synod , Diocesan Councils and Pastorate Committees .These also correspond to the Methodist Conference , District Synod and Circuit Meeting .The term Moderator is retained .

In Chapter VII of the Constitution a pastorate is defined as " an organised congregation or group of congregations recognised as such by the Diocesan Council , under the superintendence of a presbyter " ( Slosser op.cit .p60 ). Section 2 states " Every pastorate shall have a Pastorate Committee , which shall consist of the presbyter in charge as chairman , the ordained ministers who are appointed to work as assistants to the presbyter in charge , and lay communicant members of the Church elected by the communicants of the pastorate , and which may also include ex-officio and nominated members " .Further " It is competent to a Diocesan Council to form circles , districts or other groups of pastorates for certain administrative and financial purposes , and to define the membership , powers and functions of bodies representing those areas "

The diocesan Council is defined as consisting of :

- a. The bishop of the diocese .
- b. The assistant bishop ( if any ) .
- c. All presbyters in charge of pastorates , and all presbyters who are appointed to responsible offices and spheres of work which by regulation of the Diocesan Council carry with them the right of membership of the Council .Every Diocesan Council shall make rules regulating the membership of other presbyters ( whether engaged in pastoral or institutional work ) of deacons , and of retired ministers ;
- d. Lay representatives , whether elected , nominated or ex-officio , at least equal in number to the pastorates of the diocese and not greater than twice that number .

Sect 3 The Bishop of the diocese shall be ex-officio president of the Diocesan Council , and shall have the right to take part in the proceedings of any standing committee , board or council of the diocese .

Sect 4 Every Diocesan Council has power to make rules and pass resolutions and take executive action for the general management and good government of the Church in the diocese

subject to the provisions of this Constitution and in particular to those concerning the Synod of the Church. In particular , it has the right to an effective voice in the appointment of its bishop , and the right to make regulations with regard to the acceptance of candidates for ordination to the ministry , with regard to pastorates , and with regard to the discipline of the Church , subject to the provisions of this Constitution on these topics ..... " .

#### Sect. 6

The normal duty of a Diocesan Council is to deal with matters which concern only its own diocese , leaving it to the Synod to deal with matters of common interest to the whole Church , but every Diocesan Council shall advise the Synod on all matters that may be referred to it by the Synod , and has power to bring business before the Synod .

#### Sect . 7 .

The Bishop of the diocese shall have the right of suspending the operation of decisions or resolutions of the Diocesan Council which directly concern :

- a. the faith and doctrine of the Church ,
- b. the conditions of membership in the Church,
- and the rules which govern excommunication
- from the Church ,

c. the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church , or

d. the worship of the Church , and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church .

A decision or resolution so held in abeyance may be disposed of by agreement in subsequent meeting of the Diocesan Council , and if not so disposed of shall be referred to the Synod for settlement .

II . Every Diocesan Council shall ordinarily meet not less than once every two years . ( Scheme pp 61- 64 ) .

The Supreme Court of the Church is the Synod .Its composition is as follows :

1. All bishops of the Church , whether diocesan or assistant , and the officers of the Synod, shall be ex officio members of the Synod .

2. Every diocese shall be represented in the Synod by not fewer than two presbyters and four laymen , and shall have one additional presbyter and one additional lay representative

for every complete 10,000 baptised members in the diocese above the first 10,000 , up to a maximum of six presbyters and eight laymen representing any one diocese .

6 . The officers of the Synod shall be a Moderator , a Deputy Moderator , a General Secretary and a Treasurer .

7 . All the officers shall be elected by ballot of the Synod , the Moderator , and Deputy Moderator being elected from among the diocesan bishops of the Church .

8 .All the officers shall be elected during each ordinary meeting of the Synod, and shall hold office ~~to~~ <sup>from</sup> the close of the next ordinary meeting of the Synod .They shall be eligible for re-election .

9 . The Moderator shall be the presiding officer of the Synod , and the Chairman of its Executive Committee .He shall be the official representative of the Church during his term of office in all business with other

Churches or organisations .

10 .The Deputy Moderator shall preside at the Synod and perform the other duties of the Moderator during the absence ,illness or other incapacity of the latter .

The Rules 13 to 17 deal with the Powers of the Synod :

13 The Synod is the supreme governing and legislative body of the Church of South India , and the final authority in all matters pertaining to the Church .

14 . It has power to make rules and pass resolutions and take executive action as may be necessary from time to time for the general management and good government of the Church and of the property and affairs thereof .

15 . The Synod shall deal with matters of common interest to the whole Church of South India , and with those which affect the relation of the dioceses to one another and to the rest of the universal Church , and shall leave the Diocesan Councils to deal with the internal affairs of each diocese .

16 The Synod has , in particular , power to determine the number and boundaries of the diocese to form new dioceses in the Church . It has also power to determine whether anything in the Constitution of any Diocesan Council is at variance with anything contained in this Constitution , and , if it find such variance , to rule that such part of such Diocesan Constitution is of no force .

17 . The Synod has power to add to or otherwise alter the Constitution of the Church of South India in the manner laid down in Chapter XIV of this Constitution .

It has final authority in all questions of the interpretation of the Constitution and other official documents of the Church of South India .

One of the most crucial rules of the Constitution concerns the powers of the Synod in relation to matters of Faith . Rule 22 states :

" When any proposition is brought before the

Synod which directly concerns

- a. the faith and doctrine of the Church .
- b . the conditions of membership in the Church , and the rules which govern excommunications from the Church ;
- c. the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church ;
- d. the worship of the Church , and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church

the matter shall be discussed in the Synod in the usual manner , and amendments thereto may be passed ; but the propositions as approved , whether amended or not , shall be referred to the Diocesan Bishops sitting ~~separately~~ for that purpose .The Bishops shall transmit the proposition to the Synod if approved by the majority of them ; or they may , by a majority of two-thirds , either modify it and transmit it to the Synod for final voting , or refuse to submit it in any form .In either case they shall submit reasons to the Synod why they urge the acceptance of the proposition in a modified form , or why they refuse to submit it in any form .If the Synod accepts the proposed amendment of the Bishops , the proposition may then be passed and become an act of the Church .



Such a proposition shall be declared to have been passed at its final voting only if it obtain a two-thirds majority of the members of the Synod present and voting , or a three -quarters majority in the case of an alteration in the Governing Principles of the Church .

23 .

If a proposition has been referred to the Bishops sitting separately under the provisions of Rule 22 , and the Bishops have refused to submit it in any form to the Synod for final voting , or if the proposition fail to receive the support of the necessary majority, the matter shall be dropped .If desired by a Diocesan Council , the matter may be again proposed at the next ordinary session of the Synod ; and after discussion and ~~amendments~~ if any , shall again be submitted to the Bishops . If the Bishops again refuse to submit it to the Synod in any form for final voting , a vote of the Synod shall nevertheless be taken on the proposition in the form in which it was originally referred to the Bishops .If in such voting the proposition obtain a three-quarters majority of the members of the Synod present and voting ,this vote shall be recorded and the proposition shall be referred to the Diocesan Councils, together with the special report made by the Bishops .If the proposition so referred be accepted in substantially the same terms by not less than two-

thirds of the Diocesan Councils , it shall again be considered by the Synod at its next ordinary meeting and when so considered ,Rule 22 of this Chapter shall not apply , but it may be adopted by a three-quarters majority and if so adopted shall become an act of the Church .

#### Rule 27

The quorum for a meeting of the Synod shall be 40 members , of whom not less than 15 shall be laymen .

Provision is also made for a Standing Executive Committee which shall consist of all the officers of the Synod , all the diocesan bishops , and one presbyter and one layman elected from among the representatives of each diocese in the Synod by those representatives ( Rules 28- 29 Scheme pp 64-70 ) .

Chapter XI of the Constitution deals with " The Discipline of The Church " .Here Section I states :

" The ends of Church discipline are the good of the offender and the purity of the Church .  
The primary courts of discipline in the Church of South India are as follows : For Church members a local court or panchayat ; for ministers the Court of the Diocesan Council ; and for bishops , the Court of the Synod " .The present panchayats are to continue " until such

time as the various Diocesan Councils of the Church shall issue regulations , which shall take account of and so far as possible incorporate these local usages " ( Rules 3 to 5 ) .

Rule 6 states : " The Court of a Diocesan Council shall consist of the bishop of the diocese , or a presbyter commissioned by him , together with presbyters and laymen chosen by the bishop out of panels appointed by the Diocesan Council " .

Rule 15 states :

" When the Court of the Synod sits to hear an appeal from a Court of a Diocesan Council , it shall consist of the Moderator as president , and two bishops , two presbyters , and two laymen , selected by the Moderator out of panels which shall be appointed by the Synod at each ordinary meeting thereof " .

The discipline of Bishops , subject dear to the 1638 Assembly , is provided for in Rules 17 to 19 :

## Rule 17

When the Court of the Synod sits for the trial of any Bishop against whom a charge is brought , it shall consist of the Moderator as president ( or if he be unable to act , the Deputy Moderator ) and five bishops , two presbyters , two laymen selected by the Moderator out of panels directed to be appointed in Rule 15 above .

## Rule 18

In the trial of a bishop , no member of the Synod who belongs to the diocese of that bishop may be a member of the Council of the Synod .

## Rule 19

This states that if a bishop be found guilty of any offence against ecclesiastical law \* the bishops alone who are sitting as members of the Court shall pass sentence upon him . But when the charges against a bishop relate to matters of faith and doctrine , the decision shall be made by the bishops alone , the other members sitting as assessors \* ( Scheme op cit p 78 ) .

The functions of the diaconate are traditional and may be undertaken for life . Ordinarily it is a preparation for the Presbyterate .

Rule 12 states :

Deacons shall be set apart for their ministry by the laying on of hands by the bishop of the diocese " ( Scheme pp55-56)

Chapter VI of the Constitution dealing with the Ministry of the Laity gives special place to the elders , class leaders or lay diaconate .Their duties include " visiting members of the congregation especially the sick and erring ; meeting them in groups or "classes " for fellowship and edification and prayer ; having the charge of village congregations ; and generally helping the presbyter in building up the Church .Those who take part in such work should be communicant members solemnly set apart for this special service , and may be known as elders , lay leaders , class leaders , lay deacons , deaconesses etc " ( Constitution Chap VI Scheme p 57 ) . Their duties may also include the raising of " sufficient funds for the pastorate , to keep the church buildings and other property in good condition , to help the poor and sick and minister to their needs and generally to assist the Presbyters in the temporal affairs of the congregation " ( Scheme ibid ) .

In respect to worship the principle of confluence is fully observed : " The Church of South India will aim at conserving for the common benefit whatever of good has been gained in the separate history of those Churches from

which it has been formed, and therefore in its public worship will retain for its congregations freedom either to use historic forms or not to do so as may best conduce to edification and to the worship of God in spirit and in truth .

No forms of worship which before union have been in use in any of the uniting Churches shall be forbidden in the Church of South India , nor shall any wonted forms be changed or new forms introduced into the worship of any congregation without the agreement of the pastor and the congregation arrived at in accordance with the conditions laid down in Chapter X of this Constitution , ( Scheme Chap . II para 12 p 33 ) . Thus the local congregation is given full responsibility; This is stressed in the Basis of Union where it is stated " The uniting Churches believe that as the Church of a whole region , being in fellowship with other regional Churches , is ideally the embodiment of the Church universal in that region , and as similarly the Church of a diocese as a living part of a regional Church is the Church Universal expressing its one life in that diocese, so also in the purpose of God every local group of the faithful organised for Christian life and worship as a congregation or pastorate within the fellowship of the diocese , represents in that place the same one , holy ,

catholic and apostolic Church " ( Scheme p 30 Constitution II para 9 ) .The congregation shall also " have an opportunity of expressing its judgement both as to the appointment of its pastor and the selection of candidates for ordination from that pastorate " ( ibid ) .The difficulty of Lay Celebration of the Holy Communion , possible if not common amongst the Congregationalists , has been met in the same section :

" It shall be a rule of order in the United Church that the celebration of the Holy Communion shall be entrusted only to those who have by ordination received authority thereto. But it is desirable that , with the ordained presbyter ,there be present to assist him in the administration of the Lord's Supper others appointed by the Church for this purpose " .A note states " After union certain exceptional arrangements will continue until permanent arrangements can be made by the united Church .The Synod of the united Church will have full authority to make what provision is needed for the administration of the sacraments in all its congregations " ( Scheme Basis of Union p 9 ) .

The accepted " Standard of Faith " in the Church of South India has caused some criticism( Report of Archbishop's Commission pp 18-21 ; A.H.Legg Proposed Scheme Criticised pp15-16 ; Review of the Churches Vol VII No I Jan.1930 p69) .

This may be again due to the fact that the Congregationalists are participating in the Scheme .

Section 2 of the Basis of Union asserts : " The uniting Churches accept the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all necessary to salvation and as the supreme and decisive standard of faith ; and acknowledge that the Church must always be ready to correct and reform itself in accordance with the teaching of those Scriptures as the Holy Spirit shall reveal it " .

They also accept the Apostle's Creed and the Creed solemnly called the Nicene , as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith ; and they thankfully acknowledge that same faith to be continuously confirmed by the Holy Spirit in the experience of the Church of Christ .

Thus they believe in God , the Father , the Creator of all things , by whose love we are preserved ;

They believe in Jesus Christ , the incarnate Son of God and Redeemer of the world , in whom we are saved by grace , being justified from our sins by faith in Him ;

They believe in the Holy Spirit , by whom we are sanctified and built up in Christ and in the fellowship of His Body ;

And in this faith they worship the Father , Son and Holy Spirit .



Spirit , one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity " .

This is followed by three notes :

I. The uniting Churches accept the fundamental truths embodied in the Creeds named above as providing a sufficient basis of union ; but do not intend thereby to demand the assent of individuals to every word and phrase in them or to exclude reasonable liberty of interpretation , or to assert that those Creeds are a complete expression of the Christian faith .

II .It is understood that it will be competent to the united Church to issue supplementary statements concerning the faith for the guidance of its teachers and the edification of the faithful , provided that such statements are not contrary to the truths of our religion revealed in the Holy Scriptures .

III The actv of union will not debar any teacher of the united Church from using for the instruction of the faithful any confession of faith which had been employed in any of the uniting Churches before the union , and which

is not inconsistent with the doctrinal standards officially set forth by the united Church " .

This section except Notes I and III is reproduced in the Constitution .It has been criticised along two principal lines :

a. the position assigned to the Bible as the supreme and decisive standard of faith is criticised ~~because~~ the authority of the Church in the interpretation of Scripture is not made clear ;

b the disclaimers in the second part of note I are held to destroy the value of the Churches ' acceptance of the Creeds .Confirmation of this criticism is found in the fact that the use of the creeds in worship is not obligatory

( Newbigin -op cit p 125 ; Jalland **The Bible** ,The Church and South India p 7 ff ; N.P.**Williams** - A Voice from India p 9 ; T.S.Eliot Reunion by Destruction p 21 vide also Article VI by Dr A.E. Garvie The Review of The Churches Vol. VII No I Jan. 1930 ) .

The Church of South India will not be in full commun-

union with the Church of England( Archbishop of Canterbury-Open Letter to Bishop Stephen Neill-Press and Publications Board , Church House London , Sept . 1947 ) .This relationship will be reviewed at the end of the interim period . However , members of the United Church " shall not forgo any rights with regard to inter-communion which they possessed before the union " ( Note 3 Basis of Union Scheme p 21 ) . The position in respect to inter-celebration is similar ( ibid ) .The Church of Scotland will be in full communion with the united Church ( Life and Work Edin . Jan. 1948 p 2 ) .

Whilst it is idle to pretend that opposition to the scheme is entirely confined to elements within the Anglican Church it is perhaps natural that in this communion most difficulties have been felt ( Louis A.Haselmayer - Lambeth and Unity -New York 1948 pp IX - XIV ) .Bishop Hollis of Madras has , however , called attention to the statement of the present Archbishop of Canterbury : " The one act of treachery would be the withdrawal of the Anglican element .It must be maintained ,bearing its full contribution of the life and tradition of the Church " ( The Church Times June 6 th 1947 p331 ) .Bishop Newbigin pleads with the Anglo-Catholic critics " who advocate the excommunication of the Church of South India because it acknowledges the reality of the non-

episcopal ministries to consider again whether the ground they are occupying really holds out any hope at all for the restoration of the Churches' visible unity " .He further claims that an isolated episcopacy apart from the Body of Believers is no test of true apostolicity even by Eastern and Roman standards as by the non-episcopal .The Anglo-Catholic position has turned " what might have been a stepping -stone for mutual traffic between seperated bodies " into a fortified and isolated island inaccessible to either side " ( Newbigin op cit p189 ) .Dr N.P.Williams in criticising the scheme suggests that the " United Church composed of all non-Anglican elements should have organised itself in the same way in which it would have organised itself if the Anglican Church had at once come into the Union ".To facilitate future re-union the diocese of the United Church might be made geographically coincident with the Anglican diocese .The first bishops of the United Church as also the presbyters and deacons would be merely titulars. Having validated its orthodoxy the Anglican bishops would eventually approach the United Church with " the offer to impart the character of the historical as distinct from a merely titular episcopate to its bishops " . The ministry of their presbyters and deacons would then be validated and

organic union would follow." Such a procedure would , it seems to me , be justifiable in the light of the Scottish precedent of 1610 ; though it would rectify what , owing to the confusion of the times was from the Catholic point of view amiss in that precedent , by postponing complete union until the process of the Catholicisation of the hitherto non-episcopal ministry had been consummated " ( N.P.Williams , Lausanne , Lambeth and South India -London 1930 pp45 -49 ) . It is our thesis , however, that the whole process of pacific attempts in Scotland has made its real contribution to the cause of unity in South India . True Catholicism is not gained overnight , its truths have been won through the burning heat of a long day .

Dr A.E.J.Rawlinson , Bishop of Derby and Chairman of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee of Theologians formed to report on the Scheme said in a sermon preached to mark the Inauguration " A fusion of this kind embracing hitherto differing and sundered ecclesiastical traditions , Episcopalian and non-Episcopalians was a new thing in Christendom , the presage ( so many would dare to hope ) of other and greater things to come " ( The Scottish Guardian Sept. 26 th 1947 p 5 ) . Happily we can discountenance the former portion of this statement and can claim that this fusion had been achieved in at least one period during attempts at

Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in Scotland .Perhaps we would go further and assert that the latter hope would have been less possible had these attempts not been made .

The Lambeth Conference of 1948 stated " We rejoice that one part of the Anglican Communion should be found ready to make this venture for a corporate union with certain non-episcopal Churches . We feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches " They are pioneers in this direction of the movement for unity " ( Lambeth Conference 1948 p 43 ) .

The Conference Report quoted the statement of the Archbishop's Committee of Theologians that if full communion was to be established between the two churches there should be amendment of the Consitution in some or all of the following ways :

- I. The statement of the Faith of the Church should be so redrafted as to place the adherence of the Church of South India to the historic faith of the Church Catholic beyond question .
- 2.The statement on the Sacraments in the Church

( Constitution II , sect 6 ) should be freed from misleading ambiguities .

3. The use of the rite of Confirmation should , as soon as may be practicable , be made the general rule of the Church .

4 . There should be a modification of the rules for synodical ~~procedure~~ clarifying and properly safeguarding the position of the Bishops .

5. There should be reconsideration of the ultimate relation of the Church of South India to other Churches not episcopally ordered .

6. There should be a satisfactory clarification of the circumstances , if any , in which non - episcopally ordained ministries may continue to exercise ministry in the Church of South India at the conclusion of the interim period ( Report Part II , p 46 ) .

However , a majority were prepared " to accept the Church of South India as a living part of the one holy , catholic , and apostolic Church of Christ " ( ibid p. 47 ) . A minority could not accept this recommendation ( ibid p. 48 ) . It is pointed out, as we have already noted , that whilst the ministry of the South India Church was valid so far as could be guaranteed

by the form and manner these alone could not guarantee the character of a ministry : " That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself " ( ibid p. 47 ) . Thus the Church of South India in toto is as yet not in full communion with the Anglican Church ( vide Report Par.II p46 ) . Once again, it cannot be overstressed that the difficulties of Presbyterian - Episcopal accommodation in a modern setting , are here patent .



The Reunion Scheme for the Church in Ceylon is also worthy of some consideration .

The negotiating Committee for a United Church in Ceylon consists of Anglicans , Methodists , Presbyterians , Baptists and members of the South India United Church ( this latter containing , as we have noted , a large Congregational element ) . This is the first time that the Baptists have entered such negotiations . The Scheme is thus the most representative yet attempted . The Final Report was issued in the autumn of 1947 . It makes an unique contribution in the history of irenics by the suggestion of integration by Extended Ordination ( vide The Report - The Church Times Sept. 19 th 1947 pp 558 and Dec. 6 th 1946 p 743; Bell - Documents on Unity 3 rd Series 1948 pp 228- 232 ) .

The office of the ministry is stated to be liturgical , missionary , teaching and pastoral . The difference between the priesthood and the laity is not a difference of kind but of function . The Report states that no particular interpretation of episcopacy is demanded but that it is the intention of the uniting Churches that " episcopacy as it was known in the undivided Church shall be part of the united Church in the future " . Those , elected bishops of the united Church , and have not already

received episcopal consecration , shall be consecrated by three bishops from outside Ceylon " , from differing Church traditions , including the Eastern Church tradition , and acceptable to all the uniting Churches " . Immediately after this they shall receive by prayer and laying -on-of- hands by ministers of all the uniting Churches , " a wider commission to exercise their ministry in the united Churches " .

The presbyters of the united Church shall receive from the newly consecrated and commissioned episcopate a form of " extended ordination " . The formula states :

" Forasmuch as you were called and ordained to the ministry of the Church of God within the ..... Church , and are now called to the ministry of the Church of God as presbyter within this united Church ; receive from God at my hands , the power and grace of the Holy Spirit to exercise the wider ministry of this office , and to nourish by word and sacraments all the members of Christ's flock within this united Church , in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit " .

" Take authority to preach and teach the word to fulfill the ministry of reconciliation and to minister Christ's sacraments in the congregation whereunto you shall be duly appointed " .

The Report contains a form of service for this

unification of ministries .The Preface states that the threefold ministry of the undivided Church is to be maintained .The purpose of the service is " to give to the ministers of each tradition such character ,grace ,gifts and authority as they may need " .

It is interesting to note that the negotiating Committee rejected the Canadian Supplemental Ordination proposals .They also rejected the Archbishop of Canterbury's proposals set forward in " A Step Forward in Church Relations " where he stated " I should hope that in preparation for it , along the lines of recent Canadian proposals , each communion ,episcopal and non-episcopal , should contribute the whole of its seperate ministry to so many of the ministers of the other as were willing to receive it . By that means there would be assimilation at work from the start at the presbyteral level as well as at the episcopal level " ( A Step Forward in Church Relations p II ) .

In Iran the joint committee set up by the Anglican Church in the south and the Presbyterian Church in the north has been dissolved .One of the most important

reasons for this apparent failure is due to the fact that the northern Church , largely recruited from former members of the Armenian and Assyrian Churches , who have but recently cut themselves off from one episcopal tradition are hesitant to join with another( Bell -Documents on Christian Unity 3 rd Series 1948 pp233 -243 ) .

The negotiations between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians in the United States are also more or less at a standstill.

Inspite of this there is great hope : it is likely that the Church of South India will be shortly strengthened by the Lutheran Federation .It is difficult to see how both the Churches of Ceylon and South India can avoid being in the most intimate relationship .This being so we shall have the spectacle of a unity comprising Anglicans , Presbyterians, Methodists , Baptists , Congregationalists, Lutherans and the tradition of the Eastern Church ( it is hoped that among the consecrating bishops of the Church of Ceylon will be a bishop of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church ) . This will indeed be a first healing of those wounds which have so weakened the Body of Christ . Perhaps in some measure however indirect ( and yet can spiritual striving be other than direct ) the attempts at

presbyterian -Episcopal accommodation in Scotland have  
had great effect on the first rough tracings of the  
Grand Design .

## **CHAPTER 16**

---

### **SOME MODERN DEVELOPMENTS .**

The Amsterdam Conference of 1948 met at a time of great international tension and this was inevitably reflected in its deliberations the theme of which was " The World's Disorder and God's Design ". In spite of the absence of the Roman Catholic and Russian Churches from its discussions the Conference was able to announce the formation of The World Council of Churches under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury . Of this one of the delegates , Dr Boegner said, " ----- you may now build a World Council of Churches which may learn from God what it is , what it is to become , what its task is , and what it must say to the Churches and the world in an hour in history when the menace hanging over the world calls the Churches to prove their unity by proclaiming with one accord that there is no salvation for men or nations save in Jesus Christ " . The Committee studying the Universal Church in God's design " under the chairmanship of Bishop Hans Lilje of Hanover found that the deepest differences between the Churches was that of the " Catholic " Confessions with their primary insistence upon the visible continuity of the Church in the apostolic succession of the episcopate and " Protestant " Confessions emphasising the initiative of the Word of God and the response of Faith focussed in the doctrine of justification . All were agreed on the nature of the Church

and its mission .

Following Amsterdam an important if informal conference was held at Dollarbeg in October 1948 when sixty-eight representatives of the Church of Scotland , the Episcopal Church of Scotland and other denominations in Scotland were present . The Bishop of Edinburgh , Dr K. Warner , gave an account of the Amsterdam discussions. Whilst the word " re-union" was hardly mentioned at the Conference it was clear that delegates in trying to grasp the oecumenical vision were inevitably focussing their eyes on a vision of One Holy Apostolic Church .

During the Amsterdam Conference a temporary committee of Scottish delegates had been entrusted with the assets of the defunct World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. It was the hope of the Dollarbeg Conference that this situation would give rise to the formation of a Committee to co-ordinate the various oecumenical groups throughout Scotland so that denominations would be in closer touch with one another and with the World Council of Churches and with the British Council ( The Scotsman Oct. 4 th - 7 th 1948; The Scottish Guardian Oct. 15 th 1948 ) . It seemed to many members that probably the oecumenical approach to reunion offered more hope than an immediate attempt to resolve



doctrinal differences .This was in some measure verified by an important sermon preached by Dr John White , a former Moderator of the Church of Scotland and grand designer of the 1929 union , at St Columba's , Pont Street , London on Oct. 17 th 1948 .Speaking with great authority the " Apostle of Scottish Union " said that the Church of Scotland could claim to have obeyed the call to unity .The resolutions of the 1934 conference with the Church of England in favour of occasional inter-communion and interchange of pulpits , had , however , not been honoured south of the Tweed.They would ~~deprecate~~ a Church , whether Anglican or Presbyterian , claiming to represent the original and ideal constitution of the Christian Church . The cause of unity would be greatly helped when no such claim was made .Presbyterianism was best suited to the genius of the Scottish people who " loved a self - regulated freedom .It represented alike the religious convictions and the patriotism of the people " .Moreover , Presbyterianism was one of the three largest denominations in the Christian world . The Church of Scotland was still ready to face the main issues which separated the Churches , not necessarily to secure a single organisation but to foster a closer fellowship .It was , however , premature to endeavour at the moment to embody the spirit of unity in the structure of a visible organisation. The wisest and most straightforward

course would be to manifest Christian unity through fellowship in evangelical witness in social service and in common and working loyalty to the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ ( Report : The British Weekly Vol. CXXV No 3232 ) .

A resumed Conference between delegates appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to represent the Church of England , and representatives appointed by each of the Evangelical Free Churches was held at High Leigh from December 8 to 10 , 1948. This Conference begun in 1947 has proceeded on the lines suggested by the Archbishop's Cambridge Sermon . At the request of the Free Church delegates the following points were put forward by the Anglican members of the Conference as among those which in their judgement seemed to require investigation :

a. What functions other than that of ordination would be regarded as so essential to the episcopate that they must be safeguarded by a Free Church " taking episcopacy into its system ? " .It might be held that in the last resort only the function of ordaining was really essential to the episcopate .No doubt that at least would be so regarded, but surely also some oversight of the Church's life , and a final voice in declarations on faith and order . If so , would this imply :

1. Bishops voting as a House in any Free Church Assembly , so that presbyters and laity should have no over-riding powers in matters of faith ?
2. Episcopal confirmation ?
3. Some measure of jurisdiction over local congregations ?

b. The admission of women to the presbyterate ( especially if episcopally ordained ) , and the lay administration of Holy Communion , would from the Anglican point of view

questions both of interchange of ministry and of intercommunion .Underlying this , in the judgement of many Anglicans , would be the theological question of the relation of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments to the life of the Body of Christ .In other words , might not more than simply episcopacy prove to be at issue ?

C. It would be a further question whether the Anglican Church would be prepared as a whole to admit Free Churchman to Communion without previous confirmation .

At the request of the Anglican delegates the following points were put forward by the representatives of the Free Churches as among those which in their judgement seemed to require investigation :

A. The conception of the continuity of the Church . Is the most important element in this conception the episcopal succession , or , as the Free Churches have always held, the proclamation of the apostolic faith in word and by life , together with the administration of the gospel sacraments ? They were encouraged to believe that this question was not incapable of solution because of the recent statement in the Lambeth Conference Report , where it is said (p63): " None of us hold that tactual succession and correct formulæ of ordination can guarantee a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate , apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set " .

B. Is episcopacy part of the gospel ? If not , it is presumed that the same liberty of interpretation of " the historic episcopate " would be allowed as is at present allowed within the Anglican Communion .

C. If the Anglican interpretation of the functions of the episcopate reconcilable with the high place assigned to the laity in the Free Churches , in virtue of which laymen are empowered to preach , and also to take part in the decision of questions of faith and doctrine .

It is pointed out by the Report that on the question of lay administration of the sacraments there are diversities of usage amongst the Free Churches but where lay administration is permitted it is only by duly authorised persons. The existence of this practice is in large measure due to the desire to provide regular and frequent observance of the Lord's Supper .

D. Is it agreed that Anglicans could have intercommunion with Churches whose methods of admission to full membership were different from their own , such as the services of believers' baptism and " reception into full Church membership ? It is noted that in the Ceylon scheme believers' baptism and confirmation are to parts of one service .

E. Is it agreed that it is possible to establish full communion as defined in the Cambridge sermon between the Church of England and the Free Churches in this country , and yet leave each denomination to continue its identity ?

Finally the Conference stated its awareness of the fact "that this method of approach to the subject of reunion ( that suggested in the Cambridge sermon ) as compared with constitutional schemes provides no guarantee that there will in fact be a real growing together . It is essential that there should be such a growing together , and a genuine sharing of different traditions , so that the impetus towards ultimate union may come not only from the leaders but from the whole body of the Churches concerned .It is vitally important that the visible unity of the Church of Christ should be accepted as the final objective , and that this should be kept clearly in view at every stage , even though this final goal be as yet distant . ( Report - The British Weekly No 3256 Vol. CXXVI ) .

The Report was signed by the Joint Chairmen , The Bishop of Derby and Dr Nathaniel Micklem; and by Preb. Stanley Elay and Prof. R. D. Whitehorn being representatives of the Anglican , Congregational and Presbyterian Churches . The latter acted in the capacity of joint secretaries .

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

---

### **WORKS CONSULTED IN ORDER OF REFERENCE**

Janet G. Macgregor -The Scottish Presbyterian Polity -Edin.  
1926

Cambridge Modern History Vol. II

H.A. Wilson: Episcopacy and Unity London 1912

John of Fordoun- Chronica Gentis Scotorum III -2 vols Edin.  
1871- 2

Church Unity Association Papers 1911-13

Charles Seignobus - A History of the French People .Bedford  
Hist . Series 1938

Augsburg Confession Part II art VII .Trans. Rev. C.P.Kraith  
1869 Philadelphia

J.Hall -Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted .Lond. 1640

J.H. Spry - Bampton Lectures 1816 -Oxon 1817

Original Letters Parker Soc. Book I

Strype -Cranmer vol. II Parker Soc.

Report of the Church Congress 1928 Edit .

Consilium De Moderanda Controversia Opera IV and Opera  
IV , Vol. I . Wittenberg Edit . 1601 .

Works of John Knox - ed. D.Laing Edin . 1846-64 Wodrow Soc.

Calderwood History I vol. 1708

Mitchell The Wedderburns and Their work . David Laing  
Edin. 1868 also Blackwood Edition Edin. 1867

Kuyper Johannis a 'Lasco Opera Vol.II

Liturgy and Worship S.P.C.K. Lond. 2 Edit . 1933

Macphail - The Presbyterian Church . London 1908

Forbes - Irenicum Amatoribus Veritatis et pails in  
Ecclesia Scotiana -Amstelaedami 1703 .

Hort - The Christian Ecclesia 1906

Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol. XIX 9 th Edit . art.

Presbyterianism -Osmund Airy and Prof . C.A. Briggs

Florence Maccunn- John Knox Lond. 1895

Review of the Churches New Series Vol. VII No I Jan.  
1930 .

G.J. Slosser - Christian Unity London 1929

J.R. Fleming:The Story of Church Union in Scotland -Its  
Origins and Progress 1560 -1929 Lond. 1929

K.D. Mackenzie - The Case for Episcopacy S.P.C.K. 2 edit.  
1929 .

W.J.Phythian Adams - The Way of At-One-Ment S.C.M. Lond.  
1944

Seymour J. Price - Laymen and Reunion - Baptist Union  
Publications Board 1931 .

Report of the Commission for the Interpretation of  
God's Will in the Present Crisis London 1942

G.M. Trevelyan:History of England .

Rait - The Scottish Parliament 1901 .

E. L. Richter - Evangelischen Kirkchenordnungen 2 vols .  
1846

M. Crie - Life of Knox Nelson Edin 1905

Moffat The Presbyterian Churches Methuen Lond. 1928

Burnet History of Our Own Times Lond. 1897 .2 vols.  
Lond. 1724-34 ; Airy Lond. 1897 . 4 vols 1753  
The Appelation Laing mss 1845 vol. 4

Lord Eustace Percy - John Knox Lond. 1937 1st Edit .

Wordsworth - Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian Unity  
Edin . 1886 vol. I & 2 .

J.L. Ainslie - The Doctrine of Ministerial Order in the  
Reformed Churches of the 16 th and 17 th Centuries  
Edinburgh 1940

Rait - History of Scotland Lond. 1914

C.L. Warr - The Presbyterian Tradition Lond. 1933

Bramhall - Serpent Salve A.C.L. Edit .

Durel - View of the Reformed Churches Beyond the Seas  
1662 Edit .

J. Hall - Works edit Peter Hall Oxford 1837-9 ;

Mathieson - Politics and Religion in Scotland Glas. 1902  
2 vols.

Sage The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery - Lond. 1695

First Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth - Everyman Edit.

Procter and Frere - History of the Book of Common Prayer.  
Lond . 1919



Cook -History of the Church of Scotland Edin 1815 three vols .

Spottiswoode - History of the Church of Scotland Edin . 1851 .

Book of the Universal Kirk of Scotland Edit.T.Thompson 3 vols . Ban. and Maitland Clubs Edin. 1839- 45.

Bannatyne -Memorialis ed . David Laing Bann .Club Edin . 1836 .

Lord Balfour of Burleigh -The Rise and Development of Presbyterianism in Scotland Cambridge 1911

Hume Brown - History of Scotland 3 vols Camb 1909 .

Lord Bacon -Of the pacification of the Church -Works vol. I Edited Spedding ,Ellis & Heath Lond. 1870 (7vols ) .

Historie of King James the Sext .Bannatyne Club .Edin 1825

J.P. Lawson-The Episcopal Church in Scotland Edin 1844

Vit. Pat Adamson etiam Dedicat -Opera per T.Wilson appended to De Sacro Pastoris Munere , Lond. 1619 .

The Border Papers ed.Joseph Benson H.M. General Register House Edin . 1896

Crockford's Clerical Directory .

Melville Diary -Wodrow Soc.

Grub- Ecclesiastical History of Scotland 4 vols Edin 1861

H. Curteis-Bampton Lectures 1871 London 1886 edit.

J. Cooper Reunion -A Voice from Scotland Lond. 1918

Botfield's Original Letters Vol. I - Bannatyne Club  
1851 .

Mosheim Institutes of Ecclesiastical History Stubb's Edit

Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 1926

Acta Parl Scot .Edited Thomson and Innes 12 vols .Record  
Series 1844-75 .

Acts of the General Assembly edi. T. Patcairn et al. 1843  
Edin .

Mackenzie-Lives of Scottish Writers Edin 1708-22

Chronicle of Aberdeen 1491-1593

Walter Cullen -Vicar of Aberdeen Spalding Club Misc. Edin.  
1845

Doctrine in the Church of England .Report oLond. 1938  
D.D. Black History of Brechin .

M'Cr10 Life of Andrew Melville Edin . 1856

Diurnal of Occurents Edin 1833

Scott -Apologetical Narration Edin. Wodrow Soc 1846

Dunlop -A Collection of Confessions of Faith Edin .1722  
2 vols.

Spanish State Papers

D MacClean -The Counter Reformation in Scotland .  
Lond. 1931

Robert Baillie , Letters and Journals Edin 1841-42

J.King Hewison The Covenanters Vols I & 2 Revised Edit

Terry: History of Scotland Lond. 1920

Estimates of the Scottish Nobility during the Reign of  
James the Sixth .

Melville Autobiog. Wodrow Soc . Edin 1842

H.J.Laski: The Problem of Sovereignty Oxford Univ. Press

J.N.Figgis: The Divine Right of Kings 2 edit .

Select Works of Rollock Wodrow Soc .1849

King James' Works ,Winton Edit 1616

Hallam: Constitutional Hist. Everyman Edit .

T.Lathbury: A History of the English Episcopacy London 1836.

H.S. Skeat - A History of the Free Churches of England .  
London 1868

D.Neal: History of the Puritans . New Edit. 5 vols Lond.1822

The Apostolic Ministry Edit . K.Kirk Lond. 1946 1st Edit.

R. Burn -Ecclesiastical Law 1st Edit. 1760 -5 2 vols .

John Forbes - Records Wodrow Soc .

Jeremiah Collier Eccl. Hist. Vol. I 1708 & vol.2 1714

William White -History of Lincolnshire 1842

Keith. Scottish Bishops 1824 Edit .

Cunningham: Church History of Scotland Edin 1882

New Statistical Account of Scotland Haddingtonshire Edin .  
1845

Scott - Extracts from Kirk-Session Records of Perth -  
Advocate's Library Edinburgh mss.

Church quarterly Review Jan. 1911

Strype-Whitgift .Parker Soc .

W. Stephen:History of the Scottish Church 2 vols Edin  
1894-6

H. Cowan -Baird Lectures Influences of the Scottish Church  
in Christendom Lond. 1896

Pearson M'Adam Muir:St Giles Lectures 1882-3

Du Pin:Ecclesiastical History of the 17 th Century

Reid J. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland . ed W. D. Killen  
3 vols., Belfast 1867 .

Killen:Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. 2 vols Lond.  
1875.

Wood -Athenae Oxiensis edit Bliss

Life of Livingstone -Select Biographies Wodrow Soc . ed

W.K.Tweedie Edin 1845-7

R.Mant: History of the Church of Ireland from the Reformat-  
ion to the Revolution 1840

Row -History of the Kirk of Scotland 1558-1637 Wodrow Soc  
Edin . 1842 .

Register of the Privy Council of Scotland Edin. 1877- 1908

Pitcairns Criminal Trials of Scotland Vo. III

A.Peterkin , Notes on Orkney and Zetland vol.I

John Spottiswoode,History of the Church of Scotland

3 vols . Spottiswoode Soc. Edin . 1851 .

G.W.Sprott,The Worship of the Church of Scotland 1638-1661

Lee Lectures 1893 Edin. & Lond . 1893

G.W. Sprott,The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland Edin . and Lond. 1882

G.W.Sprott,Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI  
Edinburgh 1901

Nichols - Progresses , Processions , and Magnificent  
Festivities of King James the First London 1838

James VI King : Original Letters Relating to the Ecclesiastic-  
al Affairs of Scotland , chiefly written by , or addressed  
to , His Majesty King James Vi , after his Accession to the  
English Throne Ed David Laing 2 vols Bann . Club Edin .1851

W.Cramond, Extracts from the Synod of Moray -Elgin 1906

Papal Negotiations of Mary Queen of Scots During Her  
Reign in Scotland ,1561-67 ,Edited J.H. Pollen Scot. Hist  
Soc. Edin . 1901

Sir Lewis Dibdin -Dean of the Arches -Establishments in  
England - London 1932

Cardwell Synodalia 1842 Edit .

Perry - Student's Church History 2 nd Period

James Balfour -Historical Works 4 vols. Edin . 1825

A.J.Mason - The Church of England and Episcopacy

Aberdeen : Selections from the Kirk Session ,Presbytery  
and Synod of Aberdeen -Spalding Club . Edited J.Stuart  
Abdn. 1846

Dean Plumtree -Thomas Ken . 2 vols . London 1889 .

Robert Wodrow - Analecta , or Materials for a History of  
Remarkable Providences .Edited Matthew Leishman 4 vols .  
Maitland Club Edin . 1842-43

Robert Baillie , Letters and Journals .Edit. David Laing  
3 vols . Bann .Club . Edin . 1841-42

Theologicae Moralis 1632 Amsterdam .

Brereton Travels Chetham Soc . Manchester 1847-86

Masson -Edinburgh Sketches 1892 .

H.Guthry ( ie ) Memoirs of Genry Guthry ;late Bishop of  
Dunkel , in Scotland .Lond. 1702 also Glasgow edits  
1747 & 48 .

Register Abbot - fol . 123 - Lambeth .

Review of the Churches Vo. V July 1928

Clarendon Vol. I

Earl of Rothes - a Relation of Proceedings Concerning the  
Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland , from August 1637 to July  
1638 Edit. David Laing ,Bann Club Edin . 1830 .

Peterkin , Alexander - Records of the Kirk of Scotland  
From 1638-1654 Edin . 1838 .

Graham of Rothiemay History of Scots Affairs Spalding  
Club vol .2

S.C. Carpenter- Church & People London 2 nd edit . 1937

Alexander Garden- A Theatre of Scottish Worthies Glas.1878

Stanley - Life by R. E. Prothero- Murray 1893 .

J.Macpherson - The Confession of Faith .

Two Papers of Proposals

J.H. Spry Christian Unity Doctrinally and Historically  
Considered Oxford 1817 Bampton Lectures 1816



## General Assembly Commission Records

1646-47 Edit . A.F. Mitchell and J. Christie Edin 1892  
 also 1648-49 , 1650- 52 .  
 Scottish Hist . Soc .

Camden Miscellany 1883

Orme : Life of Baxter. 1830 2 vols.

H.O. Wakeman History of the Church of England 4 th Edit.  
 London 1897

J.A. Picton - Oliver Cromwell London 1889 New Edit .

Paillon Bibliotheque des Auteurs de Bourgogne 1745 Dijou

Art. Salmasius

John Aiton The Life and Times of Alexander Henderson  
 Edin . 1836

John Gillan - The Life of John Sage Lond. 1714 .

J.K. Pearson - The Whole Works of Robert Leighton  
 with Life 2 vols . London 1855

Alexander Brodie Diary Edit . David Laing Spalding Club  
 Aberdeen 1863

James Kirkton The Secret and True History of the Church of  
 Scotland Edited C.K. Sharpe Edin . 1817 .

Hume - Essays . 5 vols Lond. 1761-7 .

James Durham - The Dying Man's Testament To the Church of Scotland or a Treatise Concerning Scandal - Glasgow 1740 .

Sprott G.W.-The Doctrine of Schism in the Church of Scotland Edin . MCMII Macleod Memorial Lecture 1902 .

Matthew Henry - Life of Philip Henry Lond. 1825

Buck's Theological Dict . Vol. I

Reliq. Baxter Lib. I .

Sir George Mackenzie , Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of Charles II 1660-1671 Edit Thomas Thomson Edin . 1818 .

West - Leighton's Remains 6 vols . London 1869 -75

Bishop R.A.Knox:Robert Leighton ,Archbishop of Glasgow London 1930

H.M.Luckock - The Church of Scotland London 1893 .

Scottish Review July 1884 and Jan . 1883

Archbishop Sharp - Original Letters mss Society of Antiquaries -Edinburgh .

Lauderdale Papers : Edited Osmund Airy 3 vols . Camden Soc . London 1884- 5 .

Apostolicae Curae Leo XIII

C.T.S. London Sept . 1937 Intro . by J.Keating S.J.

Hew Scott -Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae revised & edited W.S. Crockett 7 vols. Edin . 1915- 28 .

John Nicoll :Diary 1650- 1667 Edited David Laing - Bann . Club . Edin . 1836 .

Milrot - Story Church of England .

Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen Spalding Club 1846

Robert Pollock, Tales of the Covenanters- Edinburgh .

Sir James Turner:Memoirs of His Own Life and Times , 1632 -70 , Ed . Thos Thomson Bann Club . Edin . 1829 .

Napthali or A Hind Let Loose Edin edit. 1797

T.E.S. Clark: A Life of Gilbert Burnet ,Bishop of Salisbury Cam. 1907 appendices by H.C. Foxcroft .

T. Morer: Being a Description of the Nature of that Kingdom,  
and What the Constitution of it is in Church and State  
Lond . 1715 .

Dictionary of National Biography .

Lauderdale mss fol. 26 & 42 .

S. Jefferson: Leath Ward Carlisle 1840 .

Retrospective Review . R. C. Gallienne 8 vols Lond. (Lane ( 1896

John Brown: The History of the Indulgence 1678

John Brown: An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular  
Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers ..... of the Church  
of Scotland since August 1660. 1665

Faithful Witness Bearing . Edin . 1703 .

D. Butler : The Life and Letters of Robert Leighton -London  
1903 .

Robert Law Memorialls , or the Memorable Things that Fell  
Out Within This Island of Britain from 1638 to 1684 . Edited  
C.K. Sharpe Edin . 1818 .

R . Mac Ward : The Case of the Accommodation Lately Proposed  
by the Bishop of Dunblane - Rotterdam 1671 .

Leven and Melville Papers ; Letters and State Papers Chiefly  
Addressed to George , Earl of Melville Secretary of State for  
Scotland 1689- 91 - Edited W.L.Melville Bann . Club .  
Edin . 1843 .

Crawford - Officers of State in Scotland Edin 1726

Douglas' Scottish Peerage ed. Wood . Edin . 1813 2 vols.

Haig and Brunton - Senators of the College of Justice .

Paterson mss The Episcopal Records Aberdeen .

John Blackader: Memoirs Edited Andrew Crichton Edin . 1823

James Gordon :The Reformed Bishop 1679

Bishop Sage:The Reasonableness of a Toleration to Those of  
the Episcopal Persuasion inquired into purely on Church  
Principles in Four Letters to Mr George Meldrum ,Professor  
of Theology in the College of Edinburgh - 1704 .

M'Cormick " State Papers and Letters " and life of  
Carstares Edin . 1774 .

A. Taylor Innes: The Law of Creeds in Scotland Edin . 1867 and  
Edin . 1902 .

Birch : Life of Tillotson. London 1752

J.W. Hunkin , Bishop of Truro: Episcopal Ordination and  
Confirmation in relation to Intercommunion and Reunion  
Cambridge 1929

Somers Tract vol. 2 2 edit . enlarged by Walter Scott  
Lond. 1809-15 ( 13 vols ) .

Kennet: vo. 3 Ecclesiastical Synods Lond. 1701 .

The Abridgement Vol . I . E. Calamy Abridgement of  
Baxter's History of his Life and Times -1713

Stoughton : Religion in England . 2 vols. Hodder Lond.1884

William Sherlock -Vindication of Some Protestant Principles of  
Church Unity and Catholic Communion 1688

William Carstares ; State Papers and Letters ed J.McCormick  
Edin . 1774 .

Manifesto - mss Archives The Scottish Episcopal College ,  
Edinburgh .

Mark Napier - Memorials and Letters of the Life  
and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse ,Viscount Dundee  
3 vols . Edin . 1859-62

Alexander Carlyle : Autobiography Edited J.Hill Burton  
Edin 1860 and Edin . 1910 .

Thomas Somerville: My Own Life and Times Edin . 1861 .

John Cockburn: The Historical Relation of the late General  
Assembly Edin . 1691 .

D. Macmillan: The Aberdeen Doctors -Lond . 1909

M.Tabaraud : De La Reunion des Communions Chretiennes ,Corres-  
pondences qui ont eu lieu , des Projets et des Plans qui ont  
ete formes a ce sujet , depuis la naissance du protestantisme  
jusqu' a present .Adrien Le Clere Paris 1824

A Summarie Account of Mr John Dury's Former and Later Negot-  
iations for the procuring of true Gospell Peace , with  
Christian Moderation and Charitable Unity amongst the Protestant  
Churches and Academies London 1657 anon .

J.Dury: Eirenicon , de pace ecclesiastica inter evanelicos 1634

Ollard and Crosse - Dictionary of English Church History ,  
London 1912 .

Commentatio historica -theologica de J.Duraeo ,Pacificatore  
Celeberrimo a Carolo Jesper Benzello -Helmstad 1744

Elrington and Todd -Life of Ussher Dublin 1847

T.W.Jones : A True Account of the Life and Death of William Bedall Camden Soc.

Carr - Life and Times of Ussher

Theology -S.P.C.K. Vol. L no 319 .

E.G. Selwyn : The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes .  
Cambridge 1923

G.D. Henderson : Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland  
- Cambridge 1937

M. Low : John Forbes of Corse and His Eucharistic Teaching .  
Edin . no date

J.Forbes Irenicum 1636 edit .

Hooker Ecclesiastical Polity edited Paget vide also original  
complete edit. 1617-18 Lond.

A.Bower : History of the University of Edinburgh 3 vols Edin.1817

Ancram and Lothian Correspondence

Baxter of Church Government . Practical Works Lond.1868 edit.

Charles Wordsworth - The Outlines of the Christian Ministry  
London 1872 .



Rawlinson mss 52 , fol. 57 Lincoln's Inn

Nightingale The Ejected of 1662 in Cumberland and Westmoreland . Manchester Univ . Press

Fleetwood's Works 1854 edit .

W.Lowrie - Problems of Church Unity . Lond. 1924 .

The Constructive Quarterly vol. II Sept 1914

Archbishop Secker : Nine Sermons . Lond. 1758

William Warburton : Works . Published Lond. 1811 12 vols edit. and published Cadell & Davis

G.P.Tomline : Exposition of Articles 1799

Westminster Library Reprint ( Charles Law -Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor 1717 ) .

Charles Daubeny - Appendix 1799

A. Haddan- Apostolic Succession in the Church of England -1869

Norman Sykes - The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the 16 th and 17 th Centuries -Theology Occasional Papers S.P.C.K. Lond. 1948

" A Draught for a National Church Accommodation whereby the Subjects of England and Scotland ,However different in their Judgements Concerning Episcopacy and Presbytery , may yet be united , in regard to the Queen's Headship over Both in One Church and Kingdom of Great Britain"anon Lond. 1705 .

D. De Foe - Memoirs of the Church of Scotland Lond. 1717 & Edin . 1848

John Skinner : An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland 2 vols. London 1788

Mss Register of the College of Bishops , Edin . vide Primate .

Calamy : Historical Account of His Own Life .with notes by J. T. Rutt 2 vols 1829 Lond.

Bishop Gilbert Burnet - History of His Own Time etc London Chatto & Windus 1875

R.H. Story - Life and Remains of Robert Lee . Lond. 1870  
 Mrs M.O.W. Oliphant - A Memoir of the Life of John  
 Tulloch D.D. , L.L.D. 3 rd edit . 1889 Edin .

A.J.Ross - Memoir of Alexander Ewing D.C.L. , Bishop of  
 Argyll and the Isles .Lond. 1877.

Church quarterly Review vol. 68 April 1909

John Wordsworth : The Episcopate of Charles Wordsworth ,  
 Bishop of St Andrews , Dunkeld , and Dunblane ,1853-1892  
 London 1899

Charles Wordsworth -Public Appeals in Behalf of Christian  
 Unity Edin 1886

J.C. Lees - St Giles Lect . Edin . 1883

A. Ewing " Episcopacy in Scotland " - tract .

The Spectator July 7 th 1866

A.Ewing:The Relations of the Church of England to Foreign  
 Churches , and some Examinations of her Present Position "  
 Lond . 1866

A. Ewing : A Sermon for Christmas Time -Glasgow 1871 .

The Scottish Guardian Vol. XVII No 879 Nov. 7 th 1947  
 art M.J.Roberts .

R. Buchanan : The Ten Year's Conflict 2 vols Edin . 1849

W. Wilson : Memorials of R.S. Candlish .Edin 1880

The Bishop of Salisbury : Murtle Lect . Aberdeen 1902

Church Congress Official Report .Edin 1903

An Appeal . as above Glas. 1903

Assembly Papers 1907

Layman 's Book of the General Assembly 1907

Official Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 S.P.C.K.

The Scotsman Nov . 10 th 1911 .Principal Whyte 's Letter .

Report of the Commission on Approaches to Unity to the General Convention .Cleveland Ohio 1943

Rt Rev. R.T. Davidson -The Lambeth Conferences of 1867 ,1878 , 1888 . 1896 Edit .

Miss Honor Thomas - The Five Lambeth Conferences . Lond. 1929

F.Temple and W.D. Maclagan , Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations - Longmans Lond . 1897

H.J. Wotherspoon : James Cooper Lond. 1926

Report of the Scottish Church Society 1907-8 .

The Church quarterly Review No 142 Vol. LXXI Jan. 1911 article T.Hannan " The Scottish Consecrations in 1610 " .

Report of the Lambeth Conference ,1920 .S.P.C.K.

G.K.A. Bell : Documents of Christian Unity

The Review of the Churches Vol. V No I Jan. 1928 p 18 " Re-Ordination in the Church of Scotland "

The British Weekly No 3210 vol. CXXIV May 20 th 1948 p 11

Hugh Martin Christian Reunion S.C.M. Lond. 1941 p 83

Lambeth Conference Report 1930 S.P.C.K.

W.J.Noble -Christian Union in South India S.C.M. Lond .

The South India Church Scheme-Report of the Archbishop's Committee - London 1946

G.K.A.BELL :Christianity and World Order -Penguin Series 1941

Faith and Order Lausanne ,1927 ,edi. H.N.Bate Lond.1927

Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order 1937

Convictions -A Selection From Responses of the Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order ,Held at Lausanne in 1927 - edit . L.Hodgson .London 1st Edit 1934

The World Mission of the Church , Tambaram 1938 Report , Lond.  
International Miss. Council .

G.K.A. Bell - The Stockholm Conference - Oxford Univ . Press

Report of the Conference at Oxford , July 1937 , The Churches  
Survey Their Task - Church , Community and State . Lond. 1937

The Times , March 28 th 1946.

The Churchman - vol. LXI No 3 Sept 1947 p 103

Roger Lloyd: The Church of England in the 20 th Cent . Lond.  
1946

Constructive Quarterly , Vol. VII . No 26 June 1919 art  
Kikuyu Rediviva .

Kikuyu 1894-1923 - Semi-Jubilee Book of the Church of Scotland  
Mission , Kenya Colony .

MacLaine's Mosheim Vol. V 1768 Edit .

P.V. Norwood , Progress and Prospects in Christian Reunion ,  
Halle Memorial Lect . 1929 , Milwaukee 1929 .

The Guardian No 5346 May 28 th 1948 p 258 ., correspondence  
The Church in U.S.A. - " Open Communion " .

The Church Review and Eccl. Register , vol. VII 1854 pp  
55 & 59-70 .

Tiffany - History of the Protestant Episcopal Church ( U.S.A. )

C.A. Briggs : Christian Unity . Lond. 1910 .

F.C . Grant : The Proposed Concordat between the Protestant  
Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church - New York 1940

Report of the Commission on Approaches to Unity to the General  
Convention , Cleveland , Ohio , 1943 .

Rt Rev. William T. Manning : The Issue Created by the  
" Proposed Basis of Union between the Episcopal and Presbyter-  
ian Churches - New York 1946 .

Theodore O. Wedel Episcopal -Presbyterian Unity -Ploughkeepsie  
New York .

The Chronicle Vol. XLVI July 10 th 1946 pp 222-3 .

Sherman E. Johnson art . Episcopalian -Presbyterian Union -  
The Christian Century Sept . 4 th 1946 p 1059 .

The Living Church vol. CXIII No 10 Sept . 8 th 1946

Journal of the General Convention 1946 p 325 .

United Church of Canada -Basis of Union -Historical Statement -  
Toronto 1923 Chap. I .

E . Lloyd Morrow :Church Union in Canada .Toronto 1923

The Manual of the United Church of Canada -Toronto 1944

A Report from the Committee on Re-union by the General Synod  
of the Church of England in Canada 1946 -7

Proposed Basis of Union -Revision of Joint Committee ,Sept.  
21 st to 23rd . 1921 Melbourne ,

Rt Rev. Gilbert White : Australia and Reunion.1922.

Theology Vol. V No 29 Nov 1922 pp 280-84 .

Intercommunion -A Summary of the Discussions and Proposals of  
an Australian Group 1937 -40 - Sydney 1942

mss Declaration and Mutual Formula -Final Revision Oct.29 th  
1943 communicated by the Lord Bishop of Newcastle ,Australia.

The Church Times - June 13 th 1947 .

Reunion of Christendom Edit . Bishop K.D.Mackenzie .

Proposed Scheme of Union Seventh Edition , ( South India  
Church Scheme ) Madras 1947

Report of the Edinburgh Conference 1910

The International Review of Missions vol. XXXVII no 145 Jan.  
1948 p 49 .

The Churchman vol. LXI no 3 pp 104-5 .

E.H.M.Waller ,Bishop of Madras -Church Union in South India  
S.P.C.K. 1929 .

The Review of the Churches vol. VII No I Jan. 1930 p72

C.S. Milford:South India's New Church - London 1947

J.E.Leslie Newbiggin ,Bishop in Madura and Ramnad , The  
Reunion of the Church , London 1948 .

The South India Church Scheme -Report of a Committee of  
Theologians appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to  
consider the Proposed Basis of Union and Constitution of the  
future Church of South India - London 1946.

A.H. Legg Proposed Scheme Criticised .  
Review of the Churches No. I Jan. 1930 p 69

Jalland : The Bible and the Church of South India .  
Lond. 1944

N.P. Williams:A Voice from India .

T.S. Eliot : Reunion by Destruction . Lond. 1943

Life and Work ( Journal of the Church of Scotland ) Edin .  
1948 p 2 .

N.P. Williams ; Lausanne ,Lambeth and South India -London 1930.

The Scottish Guardian - Sept . 26 th 1947 p 5

A Step Forward in Church Relations -Reprinted London 1946

J.C. Beckett - Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687- 1780  
Faber & Faber , Lond. 1948

F de Witt Batty , Th .D. The Australian Proposals for Intercomm-  
union Lond. S.P.C.K. 1948

The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference Lond. 1948

Documents on Christian Unity 3 rd Series edit. G.K.A. Bell,  
Lond. 1948

G.K.A. Bell-Christian Unity Lond. 1948

Lambeth Occasional Reports 1931-8 .S.P.C.K. Lond.1948

G. Westin-Negotiations about Church Unity 1628- 34 Upsala 1933

Karl Brauer -Die Unionstatigkeit John Duries Unter demProtektorat  
Cromwells - Marburg 1907

W.J. Sexton -Christians Unite Lond. 1948

Lambeth Conferences 1867-1930 Lond. S.P.C.K. 1948

H.R.T. Brandreth -Unity and Reunion - a Bibliography Second Edition  
London 1948

G.H. Turnbull- Hartlib , Dury and Comenius .Lond. 1947



# INDEX

## A

Accommodation , Presbyterian -Episcopal , 32 ,39 , 45  
98 ,100 , 135 , 208 , 213 ff , 245 , 293-6 ,282 ,299 ,  
300-25 , 352 , 383 , 393 , 394ff, 444 , 450 , 465 ,499.  
Aberdeen,24 .

Aberdeen Assembly ,126 , (1616)- , 168 ff .

Aberdeen Conference ( 1918 ) , 398 .

Aberdeen Doctors , 209 ff .

Aberdeen Ministers , 309 .

The Abridgement , 124 .

Adamson , P., 57 , 61 , 74 , 93 ,99 ,250 .

Aird ,J., 286 .

Ainslie ,J.L., 13 , 434 .

American Protestant Episcopal Church , 430 , 451 ff .

American Presbyterians , 453 ff .

Amsterdam Youth Conference (1939) ,443 , (1948) 544.

Angus and Mearns ,26 .

Andrews ,Lancelot ,174 .

Anglican Church , 395 , 468 , 542 , 547 ff .

Anglicanism , 418 ff .

Apostolicae Curae , 253 .

Apostolic Succession , 359 .

Appeal to All Christian People ,480 .

Arran , Earl of ., 93 .

Argyll , Earl of , 24 , 26 , 240 .

Assembly , General ., 25 , 53 , 77 , 88(1577) , 107 (1590) ,  
146 , 178 ( St Andrews ) .

Assembly Report ,1929 , 435 .

Assertory Act , 273 .

Augsberg Confession , 4 ff.

Australia , 419 , 480 ff .

## B.

---

- Bancroft , 42 , 44 , 105 , 123 .  
 Baillie , J. , 238 ff .  
 Balmerino Trial , 199 .  
 Bangalore Conference 1920 and Ministerial Integration,  
 501  
 Baptists , 302 , 493 , 542 ff.  
 Basis of Union ( South India ) , 501 ff.  
 Bathurst , Bishop of ., 481 .  
 Basilikon Doron , 114 .  
 Baxter J., 228 .  
 Beza , 15 , 67 , 69 , 73 .  
 Beaton , 26 .  
 Berwick , Treaty of , 103 .  
 Bishops , 20 , 92 , 46 ff , 63 , 75 , 83 , 95 , 113 ,  
 133 , 192 , 200 , 345 ff , 434 ff .  
 Bisset , 388 .  
 Black David , 108 .  
 Bohemia , Evangelical Church of ., 433 .  
 Bothwell , 26 , 50 .  
 Book of Common Prayer 20 ,  
 Book of Order , 421 .  
 Boyd , James ., 92 .  
 Bramhall , 350 .  
 Brechin , 25 .  
 Bront , Charles , 429 ff .  
 British Council of Churches , 520 .  
 Buccleuch , Duke of ., 358 .  
 Bucer , 20 , 21 , 331 .  
 Bullinger , 5 ff .  
 Burma , Church in ., 424 .  
 Burnet , Archbishop of Glasgow , 275 .  
 Burnet , Gilbert , 266 ff , 269 , 275 .

- Calderwood , J., 8 , 57 , 82 , 133 , 187 ff .  
 Calvin , 4 ff , 67 .  
 Calvinism , 297 , 324 ff .  
 Cambridge Sermon 1946 , 549 see Fisher .  
 Campbell , A. 50 , 114 .  
 Candlish Dr , 387 .  
 Cant , A., 271 .  
 Canterbury Cathedral , 6 .  
 Canterbury , Archbishop of 62 , 132 .  
 Canada , 419 , 467 ff .  
 Carstares , William , 291 , 295 , 354 .  
 Catechism , Agreed ., 391 .  
 Cassalis , Earl of , 243 .  
 Cavers , Minister of , 310 .  
 Celtic Church , 382 .  
 Ceylon , Church of ., 382 .  
 Charles II , 334 .  
 Charteris L. , 286 , 342-347 .  
 Chapters , 54 ff .  
 Chicago Convention , 453 .  
 Chinese Church , 446 .  
 Chorepiscopi , 331 .  
 Church , Dean ., 191 .  
 Clement , Pope , 412 .  
 Clerical Disabilities Act 1864 , 381 .  
 Congregationalists , 391 , 421 , 488 , 542 .  
 Comprehension attempts at., 295 ff .  
 Comprehension , Bill of 1689 , 301 .  
 Commonwealth , 224 ff .  
 Compton , Bishop of London ., 344 .  
 Commissioners , 112 ff  
 Commissariats , Act of ., 144 .  
 Commission , Court of High ., 264 .  
 Congregationalists , 391 , 421 , 488 , 542 .  
 Consecrations per Saltum 1610., 155 , 254  
 Consecrations in South India Scheme, 512 ff  
 Convocation , 304 ff .  
 Conventicles Act , 285 .  
 Cooke , Patrick ., 286 .  
 Cooper , James ., 13 , 59 , 158 , 295 , 413 , 432 ,  
 550 ff .  
 Cowper , Bishop., 347 .  
 Cosins , 350 .  
 Covenant , 209 ff , 224 , 243 ff , 338 ff .  
 Covenanters , 269 ff ,  
 Cranmer , 5 , 10 .  
 Cromwell , 229ff , 238 ff .  
 Cubiculars , 110 .

C

-----

Czech Brethren , 434 .

0000 0000 0000 0000 0000

Du Moulin , 304 .

## E.

-----

Edinburgh Assembly , 1560 , 17 ; 1562 , 25 ; 1575 , 75 ;  
 1576 , 77 ; 1586 , 96 ; 1690 , 294 .  
 Edinburgh , Convention of . , 142 , 293 .  
 Edinburgh , Conference . , (1691 ) , 283 ; (1937 ) , 438 .  
 Edinburgh , Parliament of . , 1584 , 93 ; 1609 , 144 . ,  
 1621 , 187 .  
 Edward , Prince Charles . , 354 .  
 Edward VI . , 5 , 19 .  
 Elders in Presbyterian Church of England , 420 . See also  
 Ruling Elder .  
 Enabling Act , 413 .  
 England , 114 .  
 England , Church of . , 40 , 64 , 302 ff . , 306 ,  
 445 , 448 , 469 , 546 ff .  
 England , Presbyterian Church of . , 336 ff .  
 Engagement , The . , 231 .  
 Episcopacy , 12 , 30 , 65 , 116 , 212 , 231 , 277 ,  
 284 , 311 , 321 , 339 , 381 , 432 ff .  
 Episcopal Enactments of 1562 , 27 ff .  
 Episcopate of 1560 , 28 , 28 , 86 , 5  
 Episcopate in American Proposals , 464 .  
 Episcopate , Devolution of 86 .  
 Episcopate , English , 253 , 382 .  
 Episcopal Church of Scotland , 30 , 354 , 355 see also  
 Ewing , Wordsworth and Warner .  
 Erskin of Dun , 16 , 37 , 47 , 51 .  
 Ewing , Alexander Bishop , 371 , 380 ff , 422 , 550 ff .  
 Estates , 52 .

F.  
-----

Faith and Order Conference ,Lausanne 1927 ,430.  
Fairfoul ,Archbishop , 25 , 156 .  
Falkland ,Convention of , 139 .  
Farel , 20 .  
Fixed presidents , 277 ff ,281 .  
Field Meetings , 285 .  
Fife ,Commission of ., 140 .  
Fife , Superintendent of ., 58 see also Winram .  
Fifty-Three Articles , 17 .  
Fisher , Archbishop of Canterbury , 128 ff.  
Five Articles , 173 ,184 ff.  
Forbes ,John of Corse , 195 ff .  
Forbes , patrick , 195 ,342 , 347 .  
Forbes ,John ( d. 1634 ) Presbyterian Leader .,  
127 , 187 ,197 .  
Fotheringay ,Execution of Mary at ., 102 .  
Foster , John , 446 .  
France , I .  
Free Church Federal Council , 445 .  
Frere ,Walter Bishop ., 20 .

## G.

--

- Gallican Churches , 5 .  
 Galloway ,Patrick ., 43 ,126 .  
 Garvin ,Bishop ., 50 .  
 General Assemblies , see Assembly and name  
 designations viz . St Andrews , Dundee , Glasgow etc.  
 Geneva ,67 ff .  
 Geographical difficulties of Churches in South India  
 494 .  
 George III 354 ff .  
 Gladstones ,George ,II4 ,I56 .  
 Glasgow ,City of , 25 ff.  
 Glasgow Assemblies of , (I58I) 92 ; (I6I0) I46;  
 (I638 ) 2I0.  
 Glasgow University , 383 ,395.see also Melville  
 Gordon ,James ., 289 ,293 ,308 .  
 Gore ,Charles ., 39I .  
 Great War and effect on Movements of Unity, 404 .  
 Grier , George ,I82 .  
 Growth of Colonial Churches , 406 .



H.  
-----

- Hall , Bishop., 4 .  
 Hanoverian Sympathy of Presbyterians , 292 .  
 Hamilton , Bishop of Argyll , 26 .  
 Hamilton , Earl of and the Tables 1638 , 208 ff .  
 Hamilton , Gavin , 153 .  
 Hampton Court Conference (1604 ) , 118 ;  
 (1606 ) 131 .  
 Hay , Andrew , 47 , 75 , 76 .  
 Harper, A., Presbyterian View of American Proposals  
 for Unity 481 .  
 Hepburn , Bishop of Moray , 26 .  
 Hessian Constitutions , 10 .  
 Henderson , Alexander , 199 , 231 .  
 High Leigh Conference 1948 , 547 .  
 Hinduism , 495 .  
 Historic Episcopate , 464 , 466 .  
 Holyrood Accommodation 1670 , 276 .  
 Hooker , Richard ., 322 .  
 Hubback , Bishop and South India Scheme , 507 .  
 Hudson's Defence of Bishops , 146 .  
 Huntly , Earl of , 106 .  
 Hummanism , 71 .  
 Humphrey , John ., 352 .  
 Hypothetical Formula of Ordination , 364 .

-----

Independents , 227-99, 302 .  
Indulgence ,The ., 270 ff .  
Indulgence , The Second , 1672 , 286 ff .  
Intercession , Day of for Unity ., 392 .  
Italy , Reformed Episcopal Church of , 381 .  
Intention , Doctrine of , 253 .  
Innocent XI , 27 .  
Instructions , 278 .  
Intercommunion , 486 ff .  
Iran Proposals for Unity , 541 .  
Irenicum ( Forbes ' ) , 1629 ; 318 .  
Irish Church , 324 .  
Irish Episcopate , 219 ff .  
Isle of Wight Accommodation , 325 .  
Islam , 448 .

J.  
-----

James I. 93 ,100 ff , 163 ff , 174 .

Jacobite , 292 .

Jedburgh , 25 .

Jean , Dean of Gloucester ,303 .

Jerusalem Missionary Conference , 446 .

Johnson of Warriston ,199 ff .

Joint Ordination Proposals in U.S.A. ,454 .

Juxon , Bishop ., 203 .

## K.

-----

Karswell , John ., 50 .  
 Ken , Bishop ., 344 .  
 Kikuyu Controversy , 448 .  
 Kirk , Kenneth Bishop ., 418-23 .  
 Kirkton , 234 .  
 Kincardine , Earl of ., 269 .  
 Kinnaird , Arthur., 359 .  
 King's College Lectures by Dr James Cooper, 398 .  
 Knox , John ., 7 , 10 , 15 , 17 , 22 , 25 , 33 ,  
 46 , 57 ff ., 167 , 291 , 331 , 359 , 463 .

L.  
-----

- Lamb , Andrew., 153 .  
 Lang , Cosmo Gordon., visit to General Assembly  
 in 1932 , 405 .  
 Lambeth Conference , 392 , 394 , 408 ff .  
 Lambeth Appeal , 216 .  
 Lambert , I .  
 Laity , Place of in American proposals , 457ff.  
 Latourette K.S. , 447 .  
 Latitudinarians , 348 ff .  
 Laurencekirk , Convention of , 356 .  
 Lauderdale , Earl of ., 262 , 273 , 288 .  
 Law , James , Titular of Orkney , 141-6 .  
 Law , William ., 350 .  
 Lawson , James ., 75 .  
 Laud , Archbishop ., 174 , 199 .  
 Lee-Rorison Accommodation , 360 , 432 , 550.  
 Leith , Convention of ., 33 , 39 , 46 , 49 , 63 ff .  
 Leighton , Roberts ., 232 ff ., 252 ff . 274 , 333,  
 412 , 419 , 465 , 479 , 550 .  
 Lennox , 92 ff .  
 Leslie John , Bishop of Ross , 50 .  
 Leslie , John , Bishop of Raphoe , 251 .  
 Leishmann C., 390 .  
 Lew , Timothy , 446 .  
 Liberal Tradition of the Scottish Episcopal Church ,  
 385 , 407 .  
 Lindsay , David ., 47 , 74 , 97 , 114 , 122 .  
 Lindsay , Secretary , 110 .  
 Linlithgow Convention , 132 .  
 Linlithgow , General Assembly of ., 141 .  
 Luther , 4 .  
 Lutheran , 7 , 16 , 431 , 448 , 542 ff .  
 Liturgy , 167 , 215 .

## M.

- Macleod ,John ., 390 .  
 M'Leod Campbell , 358 .  
 Maitland , Sir John ., 40 , 97 .  
 Marshall ,Theodore., 392 .  
 Marr ,Earl of., 33 .  
 March , Roberts,Earl of ., 99 .  
 Melanchthon , 5 , 6. 7 .  
 Melville , Andrew., 41 , 43 , 62 , 67 , 68 , 70ff  
 73 ff ., 86 , 93 ff , 108 , 117 , 127 , 130 ff .  
 Melville , James ., 105 , 114 , 127 , 131 , 143 ,  
 155 , 157 , 187 , 291 .  
 Methodists , /31 , 448 , 485 , 509 ff .  
 Methodist Episcopal Church of America , 429 .  
 Melbourne , Archbishop of ., 392 , 413 ,480 .  
 Middleton , Earl of ., 243 , 248 .  
 Milligan's Croal Lectures 1879-80., 374 .  
 Milton , John ., 230 ff .  
 Ministerial Recognition in Canadian Proposals ,470.  
 Minority Report of American Unity Proposals ,465 .  
 Missionary Motive for Unity , 374 .  
 Moderates , 122 , 269 , 340 .  
 Moderator ,Office of ., 289 see also Wordsworth  
 and South India Scheme .  
 Moderator , Constant ., 135 , 136 , 143 .  
 Moderator -Bishops , 158 .  
 Montrose , 232 .  
 Montrose , Earl of , 168 .  
 Montrose Assembly , 114 .  
 Montgomery , James ., 93 .  
 Monod , Wilfred , 428 .  
 Morer T. , 269 .  
 Morton , Regent ., 39 ff ,92 .  
 Moray , Earl of ., 26 , 40 , 106 .  
 Mott , John ., 429 , 494 ff .  
 Mosheim , 14 .  
 Moyne , M . Le , 305 .  
 Murtle Lectures , 391 .  
 Murray , Sir Robert ., 276 .  
 Mutual Formula for Ordination , 487 .  
 Mc Ward , Case for Accommodation , 283 .

H.  
-----

Naseby , Battle of , 231 .  
National Churches , 196 .  
National Assembly , 293 .  
Nationalism and Unity , 440 ff , 447 .  
Nairn , James , 286 .  
Sykes , Norman , 351 .  
Newbigin , Leslie ., 506 , 533 .

O.

-----

Oath of Supremacy , 129 .

Octavians , 110 .

Oecumenical Movement and Integration of attempts at Reunion , 450 .

Oecumenical Movement as Modern Development , 300 ff .

Oldham , J.H. 428 .

Oliphant Mrs ., 371 .

Opposition to South India Scheme , 533 ff .

Orders and Separation of Churches , 407 .

Ordinal 17 , (1620 in Scotland ) , 194 .

Ordination , 335 .

Ordination sub conditione , 419 , 500 . See also Robert Leighton .

Ordination Theories in Presbyterian Churches , 419 .

Ordination Rite in Australian Proposals , 489 .

Orthodox Church , 490 .

Oslo Conference , 445 .

Oxford Conference on Church , Community and State , 1937 ., 441 .



## P.

-----

- Paisley Conference , 281 .
- Palmer E.J. , Bishop ., 497 .
- Parliament of Perth , 129 .
- Parliament of Edinburgh , (1617) , 177 ff .
- Parallelism Theory of Presbyterian and Episcopal Ministries , 469 .
- Pasumalai Conference 1923 , 501 .
- Paterson , Walter ., 286 .
- Paton , John ., 49 .
- " period of preparation " , 403 .
- Penal Acts , 355 .
- Per Saltum Consecrations , 335 , ( 1610 ) 414 .
- Perth Articles , 210 .
- Perth Conference , 367 .
- Peterhead , 355 .
- Phythian -Adams W.J. , 31 .
- Philip of Spain , 87 , 93 , 103 .
- Henry , Philip ., 302 .
- Pledge in South India Scheme 504 ff .
- Pollock , Roberts , 261 .
- Pont , Robert , 47 , 52 , 99 .
- Porterfield , J., 49 .
- Prayer Book of 1637 , 204 .
- Prelacy , 293 , 337 ff .
- Presbyterian Bishop , 289 .
- Presbyterianism , 20 , 300 ff .
- Presbyterian Party , 285 , 298 , 305 , 308 , 330 .
- Presbyterianism suited to genius of Scottish people 546 .
- Presbyterian Church in Iran .
- Proposals , Two Papers of ., 337 .
- Proposed Basis of Union -Australia 480 .
- Protestors , 238 ff , 294 .

Q.

---

quadrilateral , Lambeth ., 410 ff .

1. 287 , 288 , 289 , 290 , 291 , 292 , 293 , 294 , 295 , 296 , 297 , 298 , 299 , 300 , 301 , 302 , 303 , 304 , 305 , 306 , 307 , 308 , 309 , 310 , 311 , 312 , 313 , 314 , 315 , 316 , 317 , 318 , 319 , 320 , 321 , 322 , 323 , 324 , 325 , 326 , 327 , 328 , 329 , 330 , 331 , 332 , 333 , 334 , 335 , 336 , 337 , 338 , 339 , 340 , 341 , 342 , 343 , 344 , 345 , 346 , 347 , 348 , 349 , 350 , 351 , 352 , 353 , 354 , 355 , 356 , 357 , 358 , 359 , 360 , 361 , 362 , 363 , 364 , 365 , 366 , 367 , 368 , 369 , 370 , 371 , 372 , 373 , 374 , 375 , 376 , 377 , 378 , 379 , 380 , 381 , 382 , 383 , 384 , 385 , 386 , 387 , 388 , 389 , 390 , 391 , 392 , 393 , 394 , 395 , 396 , 397 , 398 , 399 , 400 , 401 , 402 , 403 , 404 , 405 , 406 , 407 , 408 , 409 , 410 , 411 , 412 , 413 , 414 , 415 , 416 , 417 , 418 , 419 , 420 , 421 , 422 , 423 , 424 , 425 , 426 , 427 , 428 , 429 , 430 , 431 , 432 , 433 , 434 , 435 , 436 , 437 , 438 , 439 , 440 , 441 , 442 , 443 , 444 , 445 , 446 , 447 , 448 , 449 , 450 , 451 , 452 , 453 , 454 , 455 , 456 , 457 , 458 , 459 , 460 , 461 , 462 , 463 , 464 , 465 , 466 , 467 , 468 , 469 , 470 , 471 , 472 , 473 , 474 , 475 , 476 , 477 , 478 , 479 , 480 , 481 , 482 , 483 , 484 , 485 , 486 , 487 , 488 , 489 , 490 , 491 , 492 , 493 , 494 , 495 , 496 , 497 , 498 , 499 , 500 , 501 , 502 , 503 , 504 , 505 , 506 , 507 , 508 , 509 , 510 , 511 , 512 , 513 , 514 , 515 , 516 , 517 , 518 , 519 , 520 , 521 , 522 , 523 , 524 , 525 , 526 , 527 , 528 , 529 , 530 , 531 , 532 , 533 , 534 , 535 , 536 , 537 , 538 , 539 , 540 , 541 , 542 , 543 , 544 , 545 , 546 , 547 , 548 , 549 , 550 , 551 , 552 , 553 , 554 , 555 , 556 , 557 , 558 , 559 , 560 , 561 , 562 , 563 , 564 , 565 , 566 , 567 , 568 , 569 , 570 , 571 , 572 , 573 , 574 , 575 , 576 , 577 , 578 , 579 , 580 , 581 , 582 , 583 , 584 , 585 , 586 , 587 , 588 , 589 , 590 , 591 , 592 , 593 , 594 , 595 , 596 , 597 , 598 , 599 , 600 , 601 , 602 , 603 , 604 , 605 , 606 , 607 , 608 , 609 , 610 , 611 , 612 , 613 , 614 , 615 , 616 , 617 , 618 , 619 , 620 , 621 , 622 , 623 , 624 , 625 , 626 , 627 , 628 , 629 , 630 , 631 , 632 , 633 , 634 , 635 , 636 , 637 , 638 , 639 , 640 , 641 , 642 , 643 , 644 , 645 , 646 , 647 , 648 , 649 , 650 , 651 , 652 , 653 , 654 , 655 , 656 , 657 , 658 , 659 , 660 , 661 , 662 , 663 , 664 , 665 , 666 , 667 , 668 , 669 , 670 , 671 , 672 , 673 , 674 , 675 , 676 , 677 , 678 , 679 , 680 , 681 , 682 , 683 , 684 , 685 , 686 , 687 , 688 , 689 , 690 , 691 , 692 , 693 , 694 , 695 , 696 , 697 , 698 , 699 , 700 , 701 , 702 , 703 , 704 , 705 , 706 , 707 , 708 , 709 , 710 , 711 , 712 , 713 , 714 , 715 , 716 , 717 , 718 , 719 , 720 , 721 , 722 , 723 , 724 , 725 , 726 , 727 , 728 , 729 , 730 , 731 , 732 , 733 , 734 , 735 , 736 , 737 , 738 , 739 , 740 , 741 , 742 , 743 , 744 , 745 , 746 , 747 , 748 , 749 , 750 , 751 , 752 , 753 , 754 , 755 , 756 , 757 , 758 , 759 , 760 , 761 , 762 , 763 , 764 , 765 , 766 , 767 , 768 , 769 , 770 , 771 , 772 , 773 , 774 , 775 , 776 , 777 , 778 , 779 , 780 , 781 , 782 , 783 , 784 , 785 , 786 , 787 , 788 , 789 , 790 , 791 , 792 , 793 , 794 , 795 , 796 , 797 , 798 , 799 , 800 , 801 , 802 , 803 , 804 , 805 , 806 , 807 , 808 , 809 , 810 , 811 , 812 , 813 , 814 , 815 , 816 , 817 , 818 , 819 , 820 , 821 , 822 , 823 , 824 , 825 , 826 , 827 , 828 , 829 , 830 , 831 , 832 , 833 , 834 , 835 , 836 , 837 , 838 , 839 , 840 , 841 , 842 , 843 , 844 , 845 , 846 , 847 , 848 , 849 , 850 , 851 , 852 , 853 , 854 , 855 , 856 , 857 , 858 , 859 , 860 , 861 , 862 , 863 , 864 , 865 , 866 , 867 , 868 , 869 , 870 , 871 , 872 , 873 , 874 , 875 , 876 , 877 , 878 , 879 , 880 , 881 , 882 , 883 , 884 , 885 , 886 , 887 , 888 , 889 , 890 , 891 , 892 , 893 , 894 , 895 , 896 , 897 , 898 , 899 , 900 , 901 , 902 , 903 , 904 , 905 , 906 , 907 , 908 , 909 , 910 , 911 , 912 , 913 , 914 , 915 , 916 , 917 , 918 , 919 , 920 , 921 , 922 , 923 , 924 , 925 , 926 , 927 , 928 , 929 , 930 , 931 , 932 , 933 , 934 , 935 , 936 , 937 , 938 , 939 , 940 , 941 , 942 , 943 , 944 , 945 , 946 , 947 , 948 , 949 , 950 , 951 , 952 , 953 , 954 , 955 , 956 , 957 , 958 , 959 , 960 , 961 , 962 , 963 , 964 , 965 , 966 , 967 , 968 , 969 , 970 , 971 , 972 , 973 , 974 , 975 , 976 , 977 , 978 , 979 , 980 , 981 , 982 , 983 , 984 , 985 , 986 , 987 , 988 , 989 , 990 , 991 , 992 , 993 , 994 , 995 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , 1000 .

R.  
-----

Rawlinson , A.E. J. Bishop ., 535 .  
 Red parliament , 130 .  
 Reformation , 35 ff .  
 Repression of Covenanters , 263 .  
 Resolutioners , 238 ff , 294 .  
 Restoration Episcopate , 413 .  
 Restoration , 296 , ff , 334 .  
 Re-Union , 392 , 413 ff , 430 ff .  
 Revolution , 306 , 346 .  
 Rizzio , 107 .  
 Rollo , Lord , 363 .  
 Rollo , Canon , 391 .  
 Rorison , 360 , 364 .See also Lee .  
 Rose , Bishop of Edinburgh.,295 .  
 Rothes , Earl of , 262 , 267 , 269 .  
 Roman Catholic Bishops , 36 .  
 Roman Catholic Church , 28 , 438 , 490 .  
 Ross , 24 .  
 Row , John , 75 ff .  
 Ruling Elders , 281 ff , 345 , 389 .  
 Rullion Green , 265 .  
 Ruthven Raid of ., 70 , 93 .

## S.

-----

Sage , Bishop , 290.  
 Salmasius , 231 .  
 Saltoun , 310 .  
 Sancroft , Bishop ., 194 .  
 Sanderson , George , 343 .  
 Sands , Lord , 431 .  
 Scott's Narration , 76 .  
 Scotland , Church of , 23 , 40 ff , 241 ff , 388 ,  
 391 , Reply to Appeal to All Christian People 418 ,  
 421 , 433 ff , 436 , 514 , 546 ff .  
 Scottish Episcopalians , 389 , 391 , 422 .  
 Scottish Christian Unity Association , 390 , 429 .  
 Scottish Church Society , 390 .  
 Scougal , Bishop , 292 ,  
 Seabury , Bishop of Virginia , 355 .  
 "sect " and " Church " types of Christianity , 442 .  
 Secker , Archbishop , 349 .  
 Seignobus , Charles , 4 .  
 Sharp , James , 239 ff , 246 ff , 264 , 286 , 289 ,  
 419 .  
 Sheldon , Bishop , 194 .  
 Shotts Revival , 198 .  
 Soderblom , Nathan , 426 .  
 South India United Church , 424 , 509 .  
 South India Scheme , 217 , 419 , 424 , 438 , 447 ,  
 492 ff .  
 Soucek , Josef , 433 .  
 Spinola , 27 .  
 Spotiswoode , Bishop , 131, ff , 145 , 153 ff , 162 ,  
 173 , 198 , 204 ff ., 250 .  
 Spratta, John , 432 .  
 Stanley , Dean , 218 .  
 Stewarts , 189 ff see Absolutism .  
 Straiton , Sir Alexander , 126 .  
 Stockholm Conference of 1925 , 438 .  
 Story Dr ., 371 , 388 .  
 Strype , 5 .  
 Suffragan Titular , 51 .

## S. ( Contd . ) .

Superintendent , I, 6 , 8 , 10 , 11 , 13 ff , 23 , 25  
26 , 27 , 33, 36 ,46 ff , 50 ff ,76 , 92 , 113 , 434,  
463 , 466 .

Supplemental ordination , 471 ff , 507 , 541 .

Synods , 278 , 328 ff , 354 , 364 , 376 .

Synod in South India Scheme , 518 .

Sydsarf , 200 , 251 .

T.  
-----

Tables , The , 207 ff .  
 Tait , Archbishop , 367 , 371 .  
 Tambaram Conference , 1938 , 446 ff .  
 Tarbet , Lord , 307 .  
 Terror of Claverhouse , 289 .  
 Test Act 1681 , 291 .  
 Thirlestane , 106 .  
 Thirty-Nine Articles , 356 .  
 Tillotson , Archbishop , 302 , 345 .  
 Titulars , 49 , 50 ff 66 , 93 , 100, 113 ff ,  
 154 , 160 , 250 .  
 Tomline , George Pretyman , 349 .  
 Tonstal , Archbishop , 11 .  
 Tranquebar Conference 1919 , 499 .  
 Travers , Walter , 323 .  
 Trevelyan , Prof . C. , 33 .  
 Tudors , 34 , 190 ff .  
 Tulchan Bishops , 48 , 86 ff .  
 Tulloch , Principal , 368 , 388 .  
 Turner , Sir James , 264 .  
 Tweeddale , Earl of , 269 , 274 .

U.  
-----

Union of Scotland and England , 126 , 356 .  
Union of Churches not Unification , 498 .  
Unity and Oecumenical Movements , 406 , 443 .  
United Church of Canada , 467 ff .  
United Free Church , 391 , 419 .  
United States of America , 419 , 437 , 451 .  
Ussher , Archbishop , 222ff . , 228 , 323 ff , 412 .

V.

Viret , 4 .  
 Virginia , Bishop of ( Madison ) . , 451 .  
 visitors , Office of , 78 , 92 , 115 .  
 vox cleri , 305 .



W.  
-----

Wake , William , Archbishop , 348 .  
 Wand , Bishop , W.C. , 49 0 .  
 Warner , K. , Bishop of Edinburgh , 545 , 550 .  
 Warburton , William , 349 .  
 Warr , Charles , 15 .  
 Wedel , Theodore O. , 464 .  
 Wedderburn , 276 .  
 Weston , Frank , 445 .  
 Wesleyans , 391 .  
 Westminster Assembly , 224 , 299 , 338 .  
 Westminster Confession , 295 .  
 Western Opposition in Scotland to 1662 Settlement , 260 .  
 Wharton , Philip , 343 .  
 White , John , 546 .  
 Willock , 10 .  
 Winnipeg Synod 1940 , 467 .  
 Wilkinson , Bishop , 390 .  
 William of Orange , 295 see also Bishop Rose .  
 Williams , N.P. , 534 .  
 Williamson , Wallace . , 404 .  
 Winram , John . , 16 .  
 Women and Presbyterate , 547 .  
 Wordsworth , Bishop Charles . , 368 , 373 , 382 .  
 World Missionary Conference 1910 , 429 .  
 World Alliance for International Friendship Through  
 the Churches , 545 .  
 Worship and Oecumenical Movement , 444 ..  
 Worship in American Unity Proposals , 412 .

Y.  
----

Young , Peter ., 97 .  
York , Duke of , 275 .

Z.  
----

Zurich , Life and Work Conference , 439 .